

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

8207172

Daugherty, R. Louis

**THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS AS
PERCEIVED BY SELECTED OHIO PUBLIC SCHOOL ELEMENTARY AND
SECONDARY PRINCIPALS**

The Ohio State University

PH.D. 1981

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS AS
PERCEIVED BY SELECTED OHIO PUBLIC SCHOOL ELEMENTARY
AND SECONDARY PRINCIPALS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

R. Louis Daugherty, B.S., M.Ed

* * * * *

The Ohio State University

1981


Reading Committee:

Dr. Walter Hack

Dr. Fredrick Staub

Dr. Roy Larmee, Advisor

Approved By


Advisor
Department of Educational
Administration

VITA

November 26, 1943 Born - Steubenville, Ohio

1968. B.S., Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

1968-1969 Teacher, Copley-Fairlawn Schools, Copley, Ohio

1969-1972 Teacher, Stow City Schools, Stow, Ohio

1972. M.Ed., Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

1972-1974 Assistant High School Principal, Tallmadge City Schools, Tallmadge, Ohio

1974-1977 High School Principal, Rootstown Local Schools, Rootstown, Ohio

1977-1978 Research Assistant, Department of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1978-1979 Secondary Curriculum Consultant, Erie County Schools, Sandusky, Ohio

1979- High School Principal, Tallmadge City Schools, Tallmadge, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

"How to Say 'No' Tactfully." American Secondary Education, Vol. 9, No. 3, November 1979.

"How to Get Parents Involved, Painlessly." American Secondary Education, Vol. 7, No. 2, March 1977.

"Twelve Ways Teachers Destroy Student Productivity." American
Secondary Education, Vol. 4, No. 3, June 1974

"The Disciplinary Class, An Answer to Student Misbehavior." Ohio
School Boards Journal, October, 1973.

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Educational Administration

Minor Field: Labor and Human Resources

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VITA.	ii
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
Background of the Problem.	1
Statement of the Problem	12
Research Questions	12
Methodology.	13
Population and Sample.	13
Data Collection and Interpretation	14
Definition of Terms.	16
Limitations.	17
Significance of the Study.	17
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
The Neutral?	20
The Teachers' Advocate?.	23
A Manager?	25
Have Principals Been Ignored?.	30
Are Principals Involved?	32
The Principal and the Management Team Concept.	36
Organized Middle Management.	40
Summary.	45
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS.	47
Population and Sample.	47
Instrumentation and Data Collection.	47
Characteristics of the Sample.	49
Sample According to District Size.	49
Age.	49
Sex.	49
Level of Educational Attainment.	49

Chapter	Page
Professional Experience.	53
Profile of the Average Respondent.	53
Collective Bargaining Characteristics of the Respondent's District.	53
Professional Negotiations Between Teachers and Boards of Education.	53
Administrative Bargaining Units.	55
Administrative Team Management	58
The Roles of the Principal in Professional Negotiations.	62
Analysis of the Research Questions	64
Research Question 1.	64
Research Question 2.	67
Research Question 3.	67
Research Question 4.	69
Research Question 5.	74
Research Question 6.	76
Research Question 7.	81
Analysis of the Roles.	83
Role 1 - Member of Boards' Team.	83
Role 2 - Advisor to Boards' Team	84
Role 3 - Member of Teachers' Team and	
Role 4 - Advisor to Teachers' Team	85
Role 5 - Neutral Consultant at Table and	
Role 6 - Neutral Consultant Away from Table.	86
Role 7 - Noninvolvement.	86
Role 8 - Other Roles	86
Generalizations.	86
Analysis of Respondents' Satisfaction With Role.	87
Presentation and Analysis of Respondents' Comments	105
Satisfied With Role.	106
Not Satisfied With Role.	109
Comments Regarding the Management Team	115
Comments Regarding Administrative Bargaining	116
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	118
Review of Methodology.	118
Summary and Interpretation of the Findings	119
Research Question 1.	119
Research Question 2.	121
Research Question 3.	122
Research Question 4.	123
Research Question 5.	124
Research Question 6.	125
Research Question 7.	125
Respondents Reported Satisfaction With Roles	126

Chapter	Page
Additional Findings.	127
Conclusions.	128
Recommendation for Practice.	129
Recommendations for Further Research	131
 APPENDIXES	
A. Cover Letter.	135
B. Follow-up Letter.	136
C. Questionnaire	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. School District Size of Responding Principals (Student Population)	50
2. Approximate Age Range of Principals Respondents.	51
3. Highest Level of Respondents' Educational Attainment	52
4. Respondents' Years of Teaching and Years of Administrative Experience.	54
5. Administrative Units According to District Size.	57
6. The Status of Team Management in the Responding Principals' Districts.	60
7. Team Management According to District Size (Student Population)	61
8. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by the Respondents.	65
9. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by Elementary and Secondary Principals.	68
10. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by Elementary and Secondary Principals (Adjust X_2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)	70
11. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to District Size (Student Population).	72
12. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to District Size (Student Population) (Adjusted X_2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	75
13. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to the Status of Team Management in the Respondens' Districts.	77

Table	Page
14. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to the Status of Team Management in the Respondents' Districts (Adjusted χ^2 - observed and Expected Frequencies).	79
15. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Knowledge of Team Concept. . . .	80
16. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Knowledge of Team Concept (Adjusted χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	82
17. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Administrative Bargaining Units	89
18. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Administrative Bargaining Units (Adjusted χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	90
19. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Teaching Experience.	91
20. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Teaching Experience (Adjusted χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	94
21. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Administrative Experience. . . .	95
22. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Administrative Experience (Adjusted χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	98
23. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Level of Educational Attainment	99
24. Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to Respondents' Level of Educational Attainment (Adjusted χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)	101
25. Role Satisfaction of Respondents by Perceived Role in Professional Negotiations.	102

Table	Page
26. Role Satisfaction of Respondents by Perceived Role in Professional Negotiations (Adjusted X^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies).	103
27. Role Satisfaction of Respondents According to the Status of Team Management in Respondents' Districts. . . .	104

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM
Introduction

The principalship, whether it be elementary or secondary, has traditionally been a key educational leadership position. A veteran principal once remarked that boards of education, superintendents and central office staff can come up with all the ideas they wish; however, unless the building principal is sold on a particular idea, it stands a good chance of not being successful. The building level is the focal point for implementation of most educational ideas and programs. Whether one agrees with the feelings of this principal or not, most of us will agree that the principalship is a position of critical importance in the educational process and as such is a sensitive administrative position in most any school system.

Background of the Problem

Since the advent of teacher collective bargaining and during the last ten to fifteen years in particular, there has been a growing concern over what the role of the principal should be in professional negotiations.

Depicted as the "man-in-the-middle" between the teachers and the superintendent and school board in the bargaining process, his

position has been the focus of differing expectations and perceptions by those parties involved in bargaining.

Historically, the principal's position developed from that of head teacher or principal teacher. During the 19th Century, it was quite common for the principal to serve mainly as a classroom teacher with a small portion of his day devoted to school administrative tasks. As a rule, the superintendent was responsible for most of the district's administrative and supervisory duties. However, as schools continued to grow in size and scope it became necessary to give the principal more released time from this teaching duty to assume greater responsibilities for administration and supervision. By 1900, it was common for principals to serve as full-time administrators in most larger cities (Jacobson, Reavis, & Logsdon, 1963, p. 494). Basically, the duties of the principal teacher at the time were to serve as controlling head of the school, supervise the assistant teachers (the regular classroom teachers), and handle discipline, routine administrative tasks and determine the grading and promotion of students. In many smaller districts it was not uncommon for the principal to serve in a teaching capacity as well.

During the 20th Century the principal has assumed increasingly greater importance as an administrative and supervisory person with a corresponding growth in his responsibilities for instructional improvement. However, Wilson (1966) points out that the manner in which the principalship has evolved reflects why there is still some reluctance on the part of some board of education members, and even some teachers,

to accept the contemporary stature and leadership concepts advocated for that position.

At the beginning, the post was viewed merely as an office type activity, a chore-performance, an appointment which relieves one of teaching responsibilities in order to do those executive jobs which teachers had not time to do. Further it was assumed that a more experienced teacher in the building was entitled to relief from the classroom especially if it meant a reward of more money. The position, primarily an honor, entitled no special training or talent. (p. 727)

There is little doubt, however, that the principal's role is changing. Wilson claims that this change has resulted in . . . "one of the most difficult operational relationships within the entire school system" (p. 728). As the principal has grown in administrative and supervisory capacity, his role has been marked by a corresponding increase in conflict with teachers and with the growing ranks of central staff administrators, i.e., assistant superintendents, etc. The latter conflict areas generally revolve around disagreements over whose authority shall prevail in given situations. Wilson suggests that central staff officers be given advisory status when working within building context, thereby allowing the principal's authority to prevail. Outside of the building situation, the central staff officer having responsibility for performing duties designated by the superintendent, should have appropriate authority.

The conflict between principals and teachers is not as easy to identify and rectify. Because of his supervisory position, the principal has relative power over the teachers within the building setting. Weber (1947, p. 152) defines power as the "probability that

one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance" and authority as "the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) from a given source will be obeyed by a given group of people" (p. 342). Scott (1970, p. 385) indicates that power in organizations is, to some degree, determined by the hierarchical structure i.e., the powers are attached to a position and as such are available to any person who occupies that particular position regardless of his individual qualities. In addition to this, the organization further legitimized this power invested in the position by the encouragement and reinforcement of behavioral norms. Authority, then, is legitimated power involving:

1. A set of . . . positions linked by power relations and
2. A set of norms or rules governing the distribution and exercise of power and the response to it.

In short, a stable role structure has emerged that guides the expectations of participants, making it possible for leaders to lead and followers to follow.
(p. 385)

As previously pointed out, the principalship evolved directly from the teaching position. Despite the efforts of those who study educational administration to encourage new thinking regarding the stature and leadership of that role, as Wilson pointed out, this acceptance has been slow in coming on almost all fronts.

Possibly, there was little teacher-principal conflict in the first half of this century because perceptions of the principal's role as an authority figure were not that strong. That is, the principal was regarded by the teachers as occupying more of a collegial

role in relation to them. This is evidenced by the large number of principals who belonged to and actively participated in teacher professional organizations. More probably there was little evidence of conflict because of the prevailing secular values of that time.

Secular values are defined by Getzels (1957, p. 94) as those that include work-success ethic, future-time orientation, independence or autonomous self and Puritan morality. These may have helped to maintain the paternalistic-despotic image of the principal during that time.

Sergiovanni and Carver (1975) claim that the increase in teacher dissatisfaction over the past 15 years may be due to a change in these secular values. Under the earlier prevailing set of secular values, teachers were content for years with employment under paternalistic administration based on the human relations concept and happy-family-but-father-knows-best principles.

Conflict, dialogue and disagreement were regarded as disrupters of the human relations approach and were not tolerated. Paternalistic administration . . . appeals to many school executives because it permits them to operate superficially in a manner consistent with the humanistic purposes of the school, while providing . . . control over people, processes and policy. (p. 16)

The dissatisfaction of teachers with their stature and their desire to increase their control over their own work situation is symptomatic of the growing sense of professionalism felt by teachers and articulated by teacher organizations.

Scott (1966) points out that professionals have gained a degree of skill and as skilled specialists they demand autonomy and

decision-making authority in the application of these skills. When they join a bureaucracy, i.e., schools, they must sacrifice some of this autonomy and they must rely upon decisions made by others in the bureaucratic structure, i.e., administrators. This constraint results in a conflict between the expectations of the professional and the expectations of the organization. Thus, the results are professional frustration manifested in demands for more involvement in managerial decision making.

The last 10 to 15 years have seen a dramatic rise in teacher unionism and subsequently, more active professional negotiations, not only in Ohio, but throughout most of the country. The early thrust of this new militancy was to gain through the collective bargaining process a level of benefits and compensation teachers felt their training, responsibility and status accorded them. The vehicles for the articulation of this unrest have been two major teacher representative groups, The National Education Association and The American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). Each has its own state and local affiliates and structures.

As teachers began to feel an increased sense of professionalism, more collective effort was placed on gaining a greater voice in school policy formation and in the subsequent decision-making processes. According to Metzler (1973, p. 498) there are basically three areas in a negotiated contract: money; managerial decision making; and the rights of the parties. In his opinion, the more public employees are comparable to those employed in the private

sector (i.e., blue collar workers), the more their demands and consequent agreements are concentrated on money items and the rights of the parties. However, the more "professional" the public employees perceive themselves, the more involvement in managerial decision making is demanded. According to Engel (1972, p. 490), teachers want a greater hand in the decision-making process as it affects their conditions of work, their assignments, and their professional futures.

Boards of education and superintendents view the teacher thrust for increased involvement in policy making as a threat to their authority to run the schools. Principals, while close to the staff physically and philosophically, also view this thrust with several misgivings. They do not wish to lose the stature and authority they have strived to gain. They do not wish to be caught in the middle of a growing conflict between the teachers and the superintendent and board. They fear that their position will be eroded if the teachers gain significantly in their demands for autonomy and decision making authority and they fear that the superintendent and board will allow the principalship to be eroded in order to appease the teachers and, thus, keep them from demanding more involvement in district level decisions (Engel, 1972, p. 491).

Because of the circumstances growing out of collective bargaining agreements, i.e., contract provision application and enforcement and grievances, the principal is expected by the board and the superintendent to administer those provisions at the building level.

The principal is normally the first step in any formal negotiated grievance procedure and, therefore, is also responsible for the initial administration of this area as well.

All of this, and more, have raised questions of the role of the principal in the professional negotiations process. Should the principal be in the same bargaining unit as classroom teachers? Should the principal serve as a resource person to the teachers, to the board, or to both groups during negotiations and during the period of contract enforcement? Should the principal serve as an active member of the board's negotiating team? Should the board's team consult the principals regularly before they take decisive action at the table that may effect the principal?

These are but a few of the questions that have been raised concerning the role of the principal since the advent of and the increase in teacher bargaining contracts.

Several actions have occurred that have added increased ambiguity to what the principal's role should be in this process. The growing sense of uneasiness between Ohio principals and teachers belonging to the same professional representative organization culminated in the withdrawal of the secondary principals from The Ohio Education Association, an NEA affiliate, in 1973, followed by the elementary principals in 1974. The principals are currently represented by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals. Both the NASSP and the NAESP have state affiliates in Ohio, the OASSA and the

OASEA. The OASSA was formerly the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals. The "Principals" was dropped in a recent action and substituted for it was "Administrators" in an effort to reflect its growing nonprincipal membership including central office staff and supervisory personnel. The OAESA, representing elementary principals, took a similar step.

The withdrawal, voluntary or forced, of principals from teacher associations has been quite common throughout the country as well. In some states, such as Michigan, laws prohibit or restrict the involvement of principals in teachers' associations. This raises the question of who represents the interests of the principal at the local level. There appears to be a growing trend among principals to form their own bargaining units. Wagstaff (1973) warns of the rising frustration that principals are feeling.

Both boards and teachers are able to protect their interests. But the principal is in an untenable bargaining position, and he experiences growing frustration. It is a rare negotiating team that includes a principal. He is virtually squeezed out of a participatory role in important educational decision making.
(p. 41)

The formation of principal bargaining units is, as mentioned, becoming more common as a reaction to this frustration and is an effort to gain input in the decision-making processes they have been closed out of for the most part.

The AASA, a professional organization comprised mainly of superintendents, has only in the last seven years accepted the principal as a management member. However, on the issue of administrative

bargaining, the AASA came out very strongly against such trends in a delegate assembly resolution adopted at the 1978 convention in Atlanta. Superintendent Edward M. Powell (1978), Capital Schools District, Dover, Delaware, summed up the feeling of the delegate assembly when he stated "I find it appalling that administrators now have unions. How can they act as managers when they are acting like labor?" (p. 5).

Cunningham (1969 reported the results of a study of principals in three states. Despite the assurances that principals are members of the management team and despite endorsements by superintendents of the management team concept, the study

Revealed as much disillusionment and distrust with superintendents as teachers. They felt that the negotiating process was a fight for survival and that the first group to suffer from agreements reached at the negotiating table were those not directly represented there, giving examples from big-city contracts which, if implemented, would impede seriously the smooth functioning of the school. For example, one contract article allowed individual teachers to expel troublesome students from their classes, presumably placing the principal in a position of having to place in some class that student whom no teacher wants. (p. 258)

Whether or not principals wish to be classified as management is also of some question. In 1977, OASSA lobbied successfully to exempt principals from being classified as management in a proposed Ohio Public Employees Collective Negotiations Bill, Senate Bill, 222. However, in 1978, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators and the Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators, as well as the Ohio School Board's Association, along with seven other

professional organizations representing other administrators and supervisory personnel, endorsed the management team concept as an approach for operating Ohio's public schools. This approach would include the principal as a member of the administrative team and, as such, the principal would be represented on the board's negotiating team in an active or advisory capacity (OASSA, 1978, p. 9). This new position also makes it quite clear that principals, as administrators, "are management personnel and have a responsibility for representing the interest of the public and their elected representatives" (p. 9).

This new position by OASSA reflects a significant change in the course of one year. That is, they have reversed their position from one of denial of the principal as a management member to the principal as a member of the management team. This change reflects the differing and changing perceptions and expectancies of the role of the principal in collective negotiations with professional staff, which, no doubt, does result in some ambiguity.

The complex and difficult position the principal occupies, addressed earlier by Wilson, is best summarized by Drucker (1964):

I know of no job that has so many publics to satisfy, so many bosses to answer to. There is the superintendent and the school board, and behind them the local government and the taxpayers. There is the community at large with its interest in the school--informed or otherwise. There is the faculty and the nonprofessional staff. And, of course, there are the youngsters for whose benefit all this is supposedly going on.

I know of no job, moreover, that has so many different, if conflicting, demands made on it. The school

(principal) is expected to be an educational leader and a leader in his community. But he is also expected to be a manager, working out budgets and staying within them, . . . managing people, . . . bringing parents close to the school, . . . and satisfying . . . professional bodies . . . with a different idea of what (his) job should be and how it should be appraised. (p. 157)

Lloyd S. Michael (1968) further delineated the principal's dilemma when he said:

The greatest problem facing the secondary school principal today is his attempt to fulfill his role as an instructional leader . . . in his precarious and frequently untenable position caused by the schism developing among teachers, boards of education and chief school administrators. (p. 107)

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the actual role of the Ohio Public School principal in professional negotiations. The actual role of the principal is the role that the principals surveyed perceived the principals in their district are currently engaged in regarding professional negotiations.

Research Questions

Among the research questions that were investigated in this study were:

1. What do principals perceive as their actual role in professional negotiations?
2. Are there differences between the perceptions of elementary and secondary school principals?
3. Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to district size?

4. Are there differences between the perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an avowed team management concept and those who reported that their district has no such an avowed concept?
5. Are there differences between the perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an administrative bargaining unit and those that reported that their district had no administrative bargaining unit?
6. Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to their teaching experience and according to their administrative experience?
7. Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to their level of educational attainment?

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine what Ohio school principals perceive as the actual role they play in professional negotiations. Further, an attempt was made to determine whether significant differences occurred with respect to certain selected demographic data.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was Ohio school principals. A sampling of Ohio school principals was selected at random from the approximately 3,575 principals in the state of Ohio. While there is an obvious advantage to using large samples, e.g., representativeness of the population, there is not a straight linear relationship. That

is, once the population is over 30,000 the sample size needed to consider the random sampling representative changes little. A sample size for a population of 30,000 would be approximately 380 while the sample size for a population of 1,000,000 is approximately 385, assuming a 95% confidence level (Newman, 1973, p. 19). Therefore, it was decided to select a random sample of 400 principals. Based on evidence presented by Newman, 347 is random sample size needed for representativeness for a population of 3,500.

Data Collection and Interpretation

The data were collected by a survey mailed to 400 Ohio Public School Principals. The survey instrument consisted of two sections. One section contained questions regarding demographic data concerning the respondents and their districts. The second section consisted of questions regarding the role of the principal in the professional negotiations process between boards of education and teachers' associations in the respondents districts. The principals were asked to complete the demographic data and answer the questions regarding the roles.

Each survey was coded so as to provide follow-up to nonrespondents. An effort was made to follow up on nonresponse.

After the data were collected, it was coded for computer analysis. Each response was assigned a numerical value which, when interpreted by the computer, would calculate the statistics for that particular response. The primary statistic used for interpretation of the data was the chi-square test of significance. The responses

from the survey instrument were classified into discrete categories and put into tabular form as a set of observed frequencies.

In some cases, the expected frequencies for a given category cell were less than five. In such instances, an attempt was made to combine categories where possible. According to Cochran (1954, pp. 417-451), McCollough (1963, p. 97), and Minimum (1970, p. 390), no more than 20% of all cells may contain less than five expected frequencies. Combining categories is a method recommended by these authors to control for unreliable statistical results caused by cells of less than five expected frequencies occurring in more than 20% of all cells. Where combining was done, an explanation was included with the table in question. In instances where combining was done, two chi-square tables are presented. The first table is an unadjusted chi-square showing observed frequencies and percentages of occurrence. The following table is the combined category table showing both observed and expected frequencies and the adjusted chi-square results. In all cases where adjustment occurred the chi-square changed but in no instance did an unadjusted chi-square result in data being classified from not statistically significant to significant or from significant to not significant. For an example of an adjusted chi-square resulting from combining see Tables 9 and 10.

A determination was then made to ascertain whether the observed frequencies differed significantly from those frequencies expected. The critical value for this determination was .05 level of significance.

The emphasis on the data presentation was the answering of the research questions. In those cases where the chi-square test of significance was not appropriate, descriptive research techniques were utilized to present the data.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were applied:

Management. Management persons are those persons who: (1) supervise the operation and the management of the school and the school's property, and/or (2) are assigned administrative responsibilities for the planning, management, operation and evaluation of the educational program and services, and/or (3) submit recommendations to the superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, or dismissal of personnel.

Management Team Concept. While there may be different models of team management, most models will reflect the following characteristics: (1) controlled responsibility through participative management rather than unilateral decisions, (2) encouragement to contribute the group's ideas to the chief administrator's or boards' final decision or action, (3) collaborative thinking in resolving problems, and (4) a means of giving those who will be implementing a given decision a chance to participate in making that decision.

Elementary and Secondary Principals. For the purpose of this study, principals were classified as either elementary or secondary based upon their certification. Therefore, principals with building

responsibilities K-6 were classified as elementary; those who are responsible for middle schools (6-8) were also elementary; principals of junior high schools (7-8 or 7-9) and high schools (9-12) or (10-12) were classified as secondary. This is in accordance with the certification procedures of the Ohio Department of Education.

Limitations

The basic limitations of this study are:

1. The study was limited by sampling only public school principals in Ohio.
2. Because the study was limited by sampling only Ohio school principals, the results cannot be generalized beyond this state.
3. An assumption was made that principals know what is being done regarding collective negotiations in their districts and what their role consists of in this process for the school year 1979-80.
4. The response in terms of the return of the survey instrument was good, 73% of the sample. The follow-up of non-respondents was conducted by mail and, to a limited degree, by phone. The study is limited in that 27% of those sampled did not respond.

The Significance of the Study

A review of the literature has revealed that there is some confusion as to what the role of the principal in professional negotiations actually is and what it should be. The various parties in

this negotiations process, teachers, boards of education, superintendents and central office administrators as well as building level administrators appear, according to the literature, to have different expectations of the principal. The objective of this study was to describe the current role of Ohio school principals as they perceive their role in the negotiation process. Hopefully, this will aid others in the professional negotiations process to gain a clearer picture of the principal's actual role in this state with respect to this negotiations process and will serve to provide principals with a better conceptualization of the role their peers are currently involved in, thus helping them to better assess their own role.

Another objective of this study was to compare the actual role the respondents perceive principals in their districts as playing with certain demographic data that have been collected to determine whether or not significant differences occur as a result of differences among respondents and their school districts. It is hoped that this may provide a basis for further investigation of this problem.

One of the longstanding grievances of many principals is that they have been largely excluded from this important decision-making process. It is desired that the data collected in this study will reveal whether or not principals perceive they are indeed involved in professional negotiations and whether or not they are involved to the degree they deem satisfactory. Also the study should better illuminate whether or not principals perceive that the

management team approach and/or administrative bargaining units have been effective in gaining inclusion for them in the decision-making process.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The last ten years have seen a significant increase in the quantity of literature regarding professional negotiations and the public schools. The role of the principal in these negotiations has been the topic of a portion of this literature and is of some concern in much of the related literature where it is not the main topic. In addition, the role of the principal in this process has been the subject of several research studies during this period. Some of the literature is contradictory in nature, thus adding to the ambiguity of the principal's role and, therefore, serving to heighten the problem even more.

The Neutral?

Bass (1973) suggests that the principal be allowed to occupy an uncommitted, neutral role, in professional negotiations, serving as an advisor to both the teachers and the board negotiating teams. He contends that to throw in with either party will result in a losing situation for the principal in his relations with one or the other party and, thus, impair this effectiveness as an educational leader. The question of neutrality and whether such a stance would be, in itself, injurious to the position of the principal was studied

by Johnson (1972) and determined by him to have neither favorable nor unfavorable effects on his leadership position as perceived by the teachers and the board.

There appears to be evidence in the literature that some teachers' organizations and boards of education prefer that the principal maintain his neutrality. Nielson (1971) concluded that board members and teachers both showed reservations toward all kinds of involvement by principals in negotiations with professional staff. Principals, also, have shown some hesitancy about becoming involved in teacher negotiations. Austin (1970) in his study of the attitudes of Texas school principals toward the role of the principal in professional negotiations has found among other things that the principals surveyed appeared reluctant to take a stand on negotiation matters in which teachers were involved. He felt they apparently did not want to become involved in negotiations between teachers and school boards. Perhaps the reluctance of some principals to become part of the bargaining process is due to the fear of alienating the teachers in their buildings and, therefore, losing their effectiveness as educational leaders. As Coccia (1977) states,

Principals should never be in a position to be classified by the teacher as 'the opposition' . . . if principals are considered as members of the 'other side', (they will) lose the concept of team effort and unity in individual schools. (p. 80)

There is some research to support this notion. In a 1970 study of 231 Illinois secondary school principals by Smith, it was found that:

(1) the principal's working relationship with the staff had become less pleasant after negotiations; (2) the overall climate of the school was less desirable as related to making for a maximally effective program for the student; (3) the warmth and cooperation formerly existing had been replaced by a coldness and lack of interest in administrative staff cooperative activities in the school day and program. The feeling that negotiations can disrupt the cooperative relationship between the teacher and the principal is further explicated in the findings of a study by King (1969).

The expression of a desire to see the principal remain neutral in professional bargaining is reflected in the conclusions of research involving the attitudes of Kansas superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding the involvement of principals in negotiations (Poort, 1968). It was concluded that the majority of all respondents did not want principals to assume identity with any one particular group during collective negotiations. Williams (1977) reports that California administrators, in

An overwhelming majority, have expressed the opinion that collective bargaining will have decidedly negative consequences for California's educational system and they anticipate that the principals' ability to provide leadership to their schools will be greatly curtailed. They are particularly concerned that the close working relationship between teachers and principals will be destroyed as these two groups separate into hostile camps. (p. 12)

Indeed, to further point this out, Sussman (1978) found collective negotiations result in more grievances being filed with the principal putting a strain on his/her relationship with the staff. Also he

found that the educational climate of the school became slightly more negative as a result of collective bargaining.

The Teachers' Advocate?

Regardless of the desire of some principals, teachers, superintendents and board members to maintain a role of neutrality for the principal, it is becoming increasingly clear that the principal is a central figure in professional negotiations. Because of his/her position as the first step in most negotiated grievances procedures and because of the expectations that he/she maintain the building as an operational unit during teacher walk-outs and largely because he/she is the administrator who must work most closely with the teachers on a day-to-day basis, enforcing the terms of the contract, his/her role is quite crucial; too much so to be considered neutral (Shannon, 1970).

There are those (Coccia, 1977) who argue for the principal to align himself/herself with the teachers in order to maintain his/her effectiveness. Research conducted by Peterson (1975) discovered that the bargaining process in some school districts tended to move principals toward a stronger affiliation with teachers than with the central office. This seemed to be especially true in the Detroit Metropolitan area where the study was centered.

A study conducted by Wells (1978) of principals in the Nashville Metropolitan area showed that both teachers and Metropolitan Nashville Education Association leaders felt that principals should

remain as part of the local teachers' organization. These feelings were not shared by central office administrators. Principals were uncertain as to where their loyalties should be.

The role of the principal in professional negotiations is portrayed throughout the literature as being one of conflict, entrapped between the teachers on one hand and the superintendent on the other. He/she may feel loyalty to the superintendent but he/she also may feel a sense of loyalty to his/her staff. The principal feels the obligation to defend the rights of his/her staff as professional persons (Wood & Findley, 1975). A report of the NEA National Conference on Professional Negotiations in 1973 pointed out the dilemma of the principal quite cogently:

First, if principals were to identify themselves with the board of education-administrative team, the positive outcomes would be: (a) increased prestige and status; (b) increased attention to principals' ideas and, hopefully, increased support and action. The negative aspects would be a breakdown in the rapport between staff and principal in the building.

If principals threw their weight with teachers, these positive consequences might accrue: (a) better and more open communications; (b) greater mutual respect; (c) less autocratic behavior; (d) better teacher understanding of the principal's problem. The negative aspects of this marriage are: (a) the relationship is jeopardized by the principals' role in the grievance procedure; (b) the relationship gives an overall appearance of being too idealistic. (p. 22)

There appear to be some excellent reasons for this dilemma. Randles (1975) argues that principals are usually former teachers and, therefore, are closely allied, attitudinally, with teachers for that very reason. In citing a study he conducted in 1972 regarding the attitudes

of school board members and professional staff toward labor and management, he claims,

The evidence indicates that principals' attitudes about labor and management are not significantly different from those held by teachers. By contrast, superintendents hold attitudes toward labor and management that are not significantly different from those of school board members. However, superintendents' attitudes are quite different from those of principals and teachers . . . (in that) superintendents and board members tend to be management orientated. (1975, p. 58)

He further points out the problem faced by the principal:

This situation poses a serious value question for principals. Should they continue to see themselves as educational leaders? Should they work with their staffs as facilitators with the purpose of improving learning conditions for students? Should they act as advocates for their faculties and work to influence direct decisions that coincide with the professional judgement of their faculties? Or should they fulfill the expectations of chief school officers and school boards? Should they be more directive and less facilitative? Should they support only those faculty goals that coincide with those of 'management' and block the others? Should they perform in either mode when their personal values and perceptions of 'the good' require a compromise in personal values? (p. 58)

A Manager?

However acute this dilemma, a goodly portion of the literature takes the position that the principal is a member of management and as a member of management should have input into the professional negotiations process. There is, however, some disagreement as to the degree of this involvement.

Principals have seen their perogatives under fire and reduced by teacher negotiations according to Shils and Whittier (1968). They

have felt beleaguered. "The clarity and authority of command (downward from the board to students) which once provided some security have been eroded" (Cooper, 1976, p. 202).

Traditionally, the principal was the chief spokesperson for the needs of teachers. Professional bargaining has permitted the teacher to have direct negotiations with the board, or central administration, thus bypassing the principal and clouding his/her role in this process (Dempsey, 1975). Many principals feel that they have been shut out of an important decision-making process, one in which they have a great stake. While they can understand the probability of the teachers in wanting them excluded from their bargaining units, they have been and continue to be perplexed and angered by the unwillingness of the superintendents and boards to include them in a substantive manner in those important management decisions that affect them and their authority. Recent studies (Bardall, 1976; Nichols, 1976; Price, 1975; Shelton, 1976) indicate that there has been an actual and/or a perceived reduction in the principal's authority since the advent of collective negotiations with teachers by boards of education. Therefore, there is small reason for principals not to be suspicious of those who claim them as management yet act otherwise. Even though many principals feel that they have been largely excluded from teacher bargaining, many superintendents and boards view principals as management and perceive that they are involved in teacher bargaining as a management persons. Lieberman confirms this as he observes "more and more principals are seen as

management, not as some third party in the middle between teachers and superintendents" (1973, p. 16). There is ample evidence to support this view. In addition, Kimbrell (1977) found that both elementary and secondary principals agreed that they do not wish to be represented by teachers during negotiations and, in fact, should be part of the management team.

Price (1975) found that almost all of the principals, in his New Jersey survey of secondary school principals, considered themselves to be management; however, a sizeable number of those surveyed reported that they had no involvement in teacher-board negotiations. He also found that while they were considered by the board and by the negotiated agreement to be the board's initial representative in the grievance procedure, most of them were not consulted about that procedure prior to agreement. In research conducted by Geyer (1973), it was found that superintendents and board of education presidents considered the principal as management and were aware of the importance of principals being on the side of administration in teacher-board negotiations. However, it is important to point out that his samples were limited to 25 each of superintendents, board presidents, principals, and teacher organization presidents from Illinois, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In that same study, it was not surprising that heads of teacher associations, in contrast to the other parties, preferred a neutral role for the principal in such negotiations and strongly rejected the principal's role as board negotiator. They did, however, realistically assume that the principals would not aid them in teacher-board bargaining.

Andree (1970) takes a strong position on the principal as the board's best resource for dealing with the conflict created by the bargaining process in a successful manner.

It is he who deals with these problems of conflict almost daily, who understands what must be done. He becomes the chief administrative contributor to the dialogue that must resolve these problems. (p. 77)

Andree further recommends, quite emphatically, that not only should the principal be included in teacher-board negotiations, he should be the board's chief bargaining agent!! There are many, including principals, who would take issue with these opinions and those differences will be discussed later. What is important here, however, is that in these opinions there is no question as to whether the principal is a manager or a third party in teacher-board relations.

Principals, themselves, picture their position as one of management. In a 1976 NASSP Status and Welfare Survey, 90% of the principals surveyed identified themselves more closely with district administration than with faculties (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976).

Barea (1977a) reports that principals are often allied with boards because they have been legally excluded from teacher bargaining units in some states. That is, the prescribed functions of the position make it managerial and, therefore, not eligible for inclusion in the teacher bargaining unit under state collective bargaining legislation. He specifically cites the provisions of Michigan's law which lists the duties of the principal:

1. Supervise the operation and management of the school and the property as the board determines.
2. Be assigned administrative responsibilities and coordinate instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent for planning, management, operation and evaluation of the educational program and services.
3. Submit recommendations to the superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, or dismissal of all personnel. (p. 83)

Barea contends that according to these provisions of the statute there is no doubt that the principal is a manager. In fact, he ". . . may be managing one of the largest businesses in the community" (p. 83).

Dempsey (1975) contends that there is much evidence that boards want principals on their side, i.e., the management side. By contrast, there has been a concerted effort on the part of the teacher organizations to remove the principal from their national and state membership. He feels that the two pressures will cause principals to become more aligned than ever with management.

At this point, the reader may query as to what the problem may be. Reviewing the findings of two previously cited studies may provide the necessary clue to answer this question. Both Price and Geyer found evidence that the principal is considered and considers himself a member of management in board-teacher negotiations. However, Price also found evidence that principals are not included in that process. Geyer, on the other hand, found that superintendents and board of education presidents favored the principal in a position as advisor to the board in professional negotiations.

Have Principals Been Ignored?

Many principals feel that they have been wrongly pushed aside and even exploited in professional bargaining between boards and teachers. This problem, mentioned briefly earlier, crops up repeatedly throughout the literature.

Research conducted by Hooks (1969) discovered that of the almost 200 principals surveyed a sizeable percentage reported dissatisfaction with their lack of participation in negotiations activities. They indicated that they do not receive enough opportunities to consult with the board and the superintendent regarding bargaining decisions. This conclusion was also reflected in Smith's 1970 study of Illinois principals. His data indicated that principals were quite unhappy about being ignored in the negotiations process. Nearly 73% of the 231 respondents indicated they were not involved or only slightly involved in teacher-board negotiations. Eiche (1971) determined from his research that (1) it appeared that the future role of the principal is being determined at the negotiation table; (2) that bargaining between teachers and boards has altered the functional role of the principal; (3) the traditional authority of the principal appeared to be diminishing as a result of collective negotiations between teachers and boards, and, importantly, in light of the preceding; (4) many principals were being by-passed and were not actively involved in the process of negotiations. Others coming to similar conclusions are Smith (1972) in his study of Washington principals and Almo (1974) after surveying 302 Midwestern principals.

It is the contention of boards and superintendents that principals are "true" members of management coupled with the results of the foregoing research that lead those such as Coccia (1977) to exclaim,

Apparently, management (superintendents and boards) feel they can win support for their actions by 'promoting' principals to the rank of middle management. They are excluded from the teacher organizations and from the policy making group . . . sometimes they are given opportunities to provide input for the policy makers, (but) more often than not they are rarely consulted on matters for which they are held accountable. (p. 80)

He continues to expound that principals are only considered members of management when it is convenient for school boards and superintendents to consider them as such while . . . "In reality school (boards) and superintendents have contributed to the erosion of the authority of principals beyond recognition" (p. 79).

These appear to be strong statements, but a recent American School Boards Journal (1976) survey of principals revealed that these sentiments are much more prevalent than one might suspect. Several comments from those surveyed will serve to support this notion. For example, one principal from Iowa stated, "Principals are tired of trying to hose down educational brush fires while dodging snipers from above and below" (p. 25). A Texas principal viewed the situation thusly,

Principals are disillusioned with school boards and superintendents who tell us to get in there and win the educational ballgame, then, when the chips are down, leave us out in left field without a glove. (p. 25)

Other comments further flavor this growing feeling among principals:

"It seems we are consulted only when the decision might cause flak and someone might have to become the heavy" (Pennsylvania). "We're allowed input . . . but it's all pretty trivial" (West Virginia). "The superintendent makes the decision, reports it to the board as an 'administrative team decision', and that's the first time the principals have every heard of it" (p. 27).

In this study over 48% of the principals responding reported "serious" trouble with school boards and superintendents especially over the perogatives of the principal as a school manager and their lack of participation in what they consider to be crucial decision-making processes. This is a staggering and shocking number who have reported such feelings of alienation.

Are Principals Involved?

There is, however, some evidence in the literature that some principals are involved in decision-making in general and staff negotiations in particular and that they are having their rights protected by superintendents and boards at the bargaining table. McCumsey (1967) reported that of the 100 principals in the study, most perceived themselves as being satisfactorily involved in decision-making and teacher negotiations. However, he warned that as districts become more involved in teacher negotiations, teacher involvement in decision-making will increase, probably at the expense of the principal. In his study of 61 Wisconsin school districts, Thompson (1968) concluded that superintendents and school board members believe the principals' perogatives are management perogatives which should not

be shared with teachers. But, reflecting somewhat the problems voiced in the School Board Survey, Thompson also concluded that most of the board members and superintendents in his study believed that the principal should have no official voice in negotiations and that the principals perceived the management model in use in their schools as primarily hierarchial rather than collegial in nature. Bailey (1970) found more conclusive evidence that principals are involved in negotiations either as advisors to or as members of the management negotiations team. This role, however, was largely determined by superintendents and school boards according to his findings. In a different study involving principals in Michigan school districts, it was determined that superintendents and principals alike, saw increases in the principal's involvement in administrative decisions (McConnell, 1973). Furthermore this same research found that principals and superintendents also perceived that teacher bargaining had altered, for the better, the management practices of their school districts. In Ohio, the projected locale for this study, Bardall (1976) found that principals are actively involved in collective negotiation procedures as part of management. This participation often took the form of the principal being represented at the table during staff bargaining and participating in the assessment of teacher demands.

In the research reviewed, only Bardall reported any extensive involvement of the principal in professional negotiations, especially to the point of being represented at the table on the side of management. This is not to say that this does not often occur, but research to this time does not support such a notion.

There are several factors that may explain why the principal has not previously been involved to a substantive degree in professional negotiations. One possible explanation is that principals, themselves, did not want to become part of this process. This is especially true in the early, developmental stages of professional bargaining.

As pointed out earlier, Austin (1970) found that most of the principals he surveyed did not want to become involved in this area of board-teacher conflict and that they appear reluctant to take a stand on negotiation matters. This was, however, quite apparent that many principals did feel this way and acted accordingly. Perhaps they did so because they felt that structural looseness evident among sub-units in a school system would permit them to retain the discretionary powers they had enjoyed and they could remain safely aloof from the burdens of bargaining. The fallacy of this has been presented earlier--principals are, in fact, called upon to carry out, in face-to-face confrontation with teachers the provisions of the negotiated contract including grievance procedures. It is at the building level that confrontation between the instructional staff and the administration takes place.

This may account for another factor which caused the principal to be reluctant to enter into the process of teacher-board negotiations. Research reported earlier found that the expectations of the principal by his staff were not conducive to his involvement at the table (King, 1969; Poort, 1968; Smith, 1970). Therefore, the

principal may have been afraid of losing his rapport with his staff and, hence, what he perceived to be his effectiveness as a leader.

For whatever reasons, it is clear that many principals were not involved in teacher bargaining because they did not want to be involved. This early reluctance may have created a set of circumstances for the principal that became difficult to escape in later years. In short, the principal may well have contributed to his own lack of involvement and, therefore, a good portion of the blame for his exclusion lies with himself.

On the other hand, many principals have been closed out of this process by superintendents and boards and, therefore, these parties must assume part of the responsibility. There has been considerable evidence to support this contention.

Studies cited in previous pages have attempted to describe in very general terms the role of the principal in professional negotiations. While there has been some considerable research and rhetoric on this problem, much of it is conflicting and confusing. While the reader may be perplexed, some principals have progressed beyond that point. Some principals may be becoming more proactive in their concerns over what they believe to be their exclusion from an important decision-making process and what they perceive to be a substantial loss of their authority as a result of this exclusion. Presently they are pursuing two major alternatives: (1) the management team concept and (2) administrative bargaining.

The Principal and the Management Team Concept

The management team idea has been endorsed by several administrator organizations as a method of sharing decision making. The AASA in 1976, for example, recommended that "superintendents take the initiative in working with their staffs as teams" (p. 17). In Oregon, a joint position paper by the Oregon School Administrators Confederation and the Oregon School Boards Association stated that "the essence of the team approach to management is the involvement of team members in the decision-making process" (p. 3).

Basically the team management approach is:

1. A way of controlling responsibility through participation management rather than unilateral decisions.
2. A method which requires compromise and respect for other opinions in reaching a group decision.
3. A way individuals can participate in group decisions.
4. A way of resolving conflicting attitudes and beliefs.
5. Encouraging the group to contribute their ideas to the chief administrator's or board's final decision or action.
6. Collaborative thinking in resolving problems.
7. A means of giving those who will be implementing the decisions a chance to participate in making them. (Gmelch & Erickson, 1977, p. 10)

There are several models for this approach but it is sufficient to say that the method would involve the principal in the decision-making process to a substantial degree.

McCormick and Tiffin (1974) have suggested that this style reinforces productive behavior in individuals. Since team members are involved in the decision-making process, they have a more accurate

conceptualization of the decisions and, importantly, the rationale for them. Also, the more they become involved, the more they feel a sense of ownership in decisions and the greater will be their motivation and the higher their morale.

Gmelch and Erickson warn, however, that the management team approach is not a panacea for dissatisfied principals and employees. "It takes time to build mutual trust and openness among team members" (p. 23). To do this the superintendent must be willing to relinquish some previously held power and influence. But they also state,

Many principals justifiably feel that they are being excluded from portions of the decision-making process in which they previously were involved. Hence, they feel they often lack the authority commensurate with their responsibilities. Team management provides greater participation by principals in the decision-making process. Such participation is needed because principals are closest to the point of decision implementation. (p. 53)

Therefore, school principals as the front-line administrators of district decisions and policies should make up a major component of the management team.

The management team concept, however, has come under fire. Barea (1977b) writes that,

Generally the team concept has not been successful in the State of Michigan except in smaller districts. As one might expect, many superintendents believe they are operating under a team management concept but many of the principals would not agree. (p. 49)

The National Association of Secondary School Principals, once an unconditional backer of this concept has cooled its ardor toward the team approach as of late and has moved toward administrator organizing

as a preferable method of gaining involvement in decision-making and as a method of protecting the interests of the principal. Perhaps the suspicions voiced by principals in The American School Board Journal survey, cited earlier, are too strong to permit the level of trust and openness necessary for the team concept to succeed. Perhaps many superintendents have been guilty of adopting this approach in rhetoric only. Research by Ladd (1977) would substantiate this to some degree. In his survey of the population of the Ohio Council of Administrator Personnel Associations (OCAPA), he found a difference in perceptions between superintendents and OCAPA leaders concerning the traditional hierarchial and management team relationships. These differences reflected that OCAPA leaders feel the management team is not working and is, in effect, still exemplified by a traditional hierarchial approach in actual practice. The superintendents, obviously, feel differently.

In Ohio, however, secondary and elementary principals, through their state associations (the OASSA and the OAESA), have endorsed the management team as the recommended approach for operating the public schools in that state. This was a dramatic reversal for the secondary principals' association who, only a year before, had lobbied heavily to have its principals not be considered as management persons in the terms of a proposed public employee collective bargaining bill that was subsequently defeated.

Part of the commitment these organizations had to make in their endorsement of this team approach was their recognition that when

principals leave the ranks of teachers to become a part of management, this brings with it a change in expectations on issues such as collective bargaining by administrators which is deemed incompatible with the management team approach and the fact that they are, indeed, management personnel. Superintendents, likewise, through their organization's commitments, must be willing to relinquish previously held power and influence and make provisions for greater participation by other administrators in decision-making processes (OASSA, 1979, p. 11).

The success of this proposal, of course, remains to be seen; however, if the parties to this plan, eight organizations representing administrators at the building and central office level in Ohio plus the School Boards Association, are successful in carrying out this approach in shared responsibility and decision-making, it could well rekindle interest in participative management in other states.

However, in October, 1980, a panel consisting of Dr. William Drury, President of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators; Howard Troutner, Executive Director of the Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators; Paul Frank, President-elect of the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators; Dr. Robert Homan, President of the Ohio Association of School Curriculum Directors and Richard Lee, President of the Ohio School Boards Association spoke to a large group of school superintendents and other school administrators regarding the Team Management Concept. Their general feelings were that the concept, in football terms, was at "4th down and 9 to

go." This was largely the result of the unenthusiastic acceptance of the concept by principals who, in their opinion, saw much lip service but little action toward developing such a concept. In short, regardless of the reasons, it appeared to them that principals in Ohio have not yet wholeheartedly, nor in a wholesale manner, accepted the team management idea as expected and desired by superintendents and boards.

Organized Middle Management

School Boards and their mouth-piece superintendents had their chance to win us over and they flubbed it. They've given us volumes of empty talk about our being 'managers' but we have absolutely no real authority to manage anything. They've left us alone and unsupported while they've signed away everything to the teachers. And they've done it all directly--hardly even considering us. Now they don't just want us to live with their actions; they actually expect us to enforce them. For principals the handwriting is on the wall in capital letters. It says: FORM YOUR OWN TOUGH UNION OR DIE ON THE VINE! (Martin, 1976, p. 25)

This harsh comment came from a Michigan principal, one of the participants in an American School Board survey of principals. It dramatically illustrates the feeling of a growing number of middle managers throughout the country. David Martin, Executive Vice President of the Ohio School Boards Association points out that 86% of the principals responding to this survey favor administrative bargaining unit formation and laws that will support their right to bargain directly with their boards (p. 25). By contrast, only 30% indicated that they have a voice through the management team.

The thought of administrators bargaining strikes an abhorrent note with many school board members and superintendents. According

to a 1978 AASA Convention resolution, management personnel should not be part of any bargaining unit. James Moran, director of the New Jersey Association of School Administrators, stated, "The management team depends on managers being together and not split at the bargaining table."

Regardless of board or superintendent feelings on the subject, administrative bargaining is becoming a more popular topic with principals in particular. The Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals, for example, took a strong stand in support of administrative bargaining. In their legislative position for 1977-1978, they not only supported a law that would permit bargaining by middle management, among others, but also would allow for middle managers to enjoy binding arbitration.

However, since that time they have modified this position. The 1980-81 position of this organization is that when there is evidence that the team management concept is not operational, the organization will support collective bargaining for administrators.

Prior to 1970, few administrator bargaining units existed in this country. However, by 1977, approximately 1275 units existed of which over 300 had written agreements (Bridges & Cooper, 1976, p. 306). Kimbrell (1977) and McCobb (1980) both discovered that principals philosophically identify with the management functions of a school system and desire to perform a strong management role in the schools. However, principals in both studies expressed the need and desire for

the protection of a collective bargaining agreement regarding their own wages, hours and conditions of employment.

It is interesting to note that a national union, affiliated with AFL-CIO, the American Federation of School Administrators now has 52 locals and over 9,500 members (p. 306). The stands that state principals' associations have begun to take regarding the "rights" of their members may seem somewhat akin to the shift of the NEA that was taken when challenged by the AFT.

Since 1947, however, private sector managers have been prohibited, in the Taft-Hartley Act, from organizing bargaining units. Executive orders 10988 and 11491, both aimed at public sector Federal employees, have prohibited the bargaining of supervisory personnel. Prior to 1947, however, private sector supervisory persons were allowed to organize and bargain under National Labor Relations Board rulings in the Union Collieries Coal Co., 41 N. L. R. B. 961, 44 N. L. R. B. 165 (1942), and the Godchaux Sugars, Inc., 44 N. L. R. B. (1942), cases and others.

The most significant test of managerial rank in the eyes of the New York State Public Employees Relations Board is the participation in collective negotiations. According to the P. E. R. B., to warrant the managerial designation, two criteria must be met: (1) the person must be a part of the decision-making process that prepares for collective negotiations with rank and file employees (e.g., teachers); (2) there must be involvement, of a direct nature, in the bargaining process. Being present as an observer or as a resource person

does not suffice. In this respect, neither does occasional offering of advice, solicited or not, on negotiating topics. In short, one must function in a decision-making capacity to be considered a manager (p. 311).

This is an important point and one that is sure to be reviewed as more states consider public employee bargaining laws. However, in recent proposed Ohio legislation of this type, Ohio principals' associations were successful in having the principal removed from supervisory designation. The legislation became stalled and, therefore, was not passed. The point here is, though, such removal of the principal in public employee bargaining laws could well result in the legitimacy of bona fide principal bargaining units. As it now stands, in Ohio the discretion to grant bargaining unit status to administrators is up to local boards of education. If subsequent bargaining legislation passes that removes the principal from managerial status, then local boards may be faced with less discretion in the matter. As a matter of note here, a strike by certified employees at Union Local in Belmont County, Ohio, April, 1980, resulted in principals walking out also. This situation ostensibly grew from the lack of a management team and has subsequently incurred much attention in the State of Ohio.

It appears that principals, caught in what they perceive as an irritating conflict, have opted to pursue two alternatives. The management team up to now has been perceived by many of them to be ineffective in granting them sufficient decision-making input;

therefore, many are now looking toward administrator bargaining as the answer. There are risks involved including possible job loss. However, Barea (1977b) points out once legal authority to organize is gained, job loss without cause is remote. Some states such as Florida, in Florida law 76-214, have removed the rights of administrators to bargain. Nevertheless, bargaining by management personnel with their employers, a rarity in the private sector, appears to be on its way to becoming a rather common phenomenon in the public schools. A recent research report published by the American Association of School Personnel Administrators (Evans, Knox, & Wiederman, 1978) indicates that while educators "see increased pressure building within the administrative ranks to engage in collective bargaining with their boards of education" (p. 71) . . . "administrator bargaining is perceived to have less public support than teacher bargaining" (p. 63). In short, there is not much chance in an upswing of public sympathy for administrative bargaining soon, given the definite predictions for increased board support by the public in teacher negotiations over the next few years (p. 63).

There is research, however, to support this method for principals to be heard. Bardall (1976) reported that 70% of the Ohio principals he surveyed favored their own bargaining units. Boettcher (1976) recommended, after conducting a study of Minnesota principals, that principals form their own bargaining units due to a loss of management status. Price (1975) warned that unless superintendents and boards recognized the principal's dilemma and honestly moved toward a

true team management approach, they might well be facing an adversary relationship between themselves and the principals which would not benefit the operations of the district. These positions were also reflected in research by Almo (1974), McConnell (1973), Smith (1972), and others. All came to the conclusions that there is great dissent festering among principals, largely over the issues of loss of status and lack of consideration in decision-making. All suggest that more will be heard of the formation of administrative bargaining units in the next few years. There are indications in most of this research that one way to avoid such confrontation is for boards and superintendents to permit the principals to play a larger role in professional negotiations and other decision-making processes in substantive manners.

Summary

There has been considerable research on the role of the principal in professional negotiations. This literature describes the principal in many roles as a neutral, a teacher advocate, a manager, and a militant. There is little doubt that the principal is as confused as the literature about his/her role in this important process. From the literature it appears, however, that the principal, regardless of former feelings, now wants to be a part of this process. It may be incumbent upon boards and superintendents to find ways of including them. The important question is what of the principal? How do they view their role in this process? Are they still fearful

of staff alienation? These questions and others hopefully were addressed in this study.

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Population and Sample

The population for the study was Ohio public school principals. Four hundred elementary and secondary principals were selected using the 1979-80 Ohio Educational Directory to determine their names and their school addresses. Each principal in the directory was assigned a number. Numbers were selected at random until a sample of 400 was reached. The sample included 131 secondary principals and 269 elementary principals as described in the "definition of terms".

Instrumentation and Data Collection

A survey instrument was developed and given to a panel of practicing principals. These principals were individuals who were current elementary and secondary school principals. The principals were: Mr. William McKinley, principal, Reynoldsburg High School; Mr. Larry Incarnato, principal, Vermilion Middle School; Mrs. Mary Kruse, principal, Meadowlawn Elementary School (Perkins Local); Mr. James Wilkins, principal, Revere High School; Mr. Roy Begley, principal, Edison Elementary School (Dayton); Mr. Robert Parsons, principal, Cuyahoga Falls High School; Mrs. Betty Arend, principal, Milan Elementary School (Berlin-Milan Local).

This panel reviewed the survey instrument and made recommendations regarding its content and construction. These recommendations resulted in changes in the instrument which was again submitted to them for their review and approval. This process culminated in the adoption of the survey instrument after the final approval of this instrument by the reading committee (see Appendix C).

The survey instrument was enclosed with a cover letter (see Appendix A) and an addressed-stamped envelope in another envelope and sent to the 400 principals comprising the sample. After one follow-up attempt to nonrespondents, 292 surveys were returned resulting in a 73% return. The follow-up consisted of sending the nonrespondent another survey instrument and cover letter urging his/her cooperation. Before the follow-up attempt, 251 surveys were received. The follow-up yielded another 41 responses. An attempt was made to contact nonrespondents by phone where feasible. Reasons given for nonresponse were: district does not engage in professional bargaining; retirement of nonrespondent; survey too long; nonrespondent no longer employed in district; not interested in subject of survey; didn't have time to complete survey; nonrespondent deceased. Of the 292 surveys returned, 288 were judged useable resulting in a 72% useable sample. Reasons for rejection were: survey not completed, respondent complained that it was too long, (one); respondent no longer a principal, (one); returned after the cut-off date, (two). Of the 161 secondary principals sampled, 142 returned the surveys for an 88% return; of the 239 elementary principals, 146 returned the surveys for a 61% return.

Once the surveys were collected, the information, contained in them, with the exception of written responses, was coded onto IBM Fortran coding sheets and subsequently key punched onto computer cards for processing. After the key punching, the cards were fed into a computer and subsequent data printouts were made available by this process.

Characteristics of the Sample

Sample According to District Size

There were 288 responses to the survey. Of those responding, 146 were elementary principals and 142 were secondary principals. The sample reflected both large and small school district sizes with respect to student population as shown by the data in Table 1.

Age

The respondents were asked to indicate the approximate age range into which their age fell. The results of this question are described by the data included in Table 2. The mean age was 41-45.

Sex

Of the respondents, 242 were males and 46 were females.

Level of Educational Attainment

The majority of the sample had completed graduate work beyond the Master's degree, but had not earned a degree beyond the Master's. The data regarding the level of educational attainment for those responding are presented in Table 3.

Table 1
 School District Size of Responding Principals
 (Student Population)

Approximate Student Population	Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies F
less than 2,000	82	28.5
2,000 - 4,999	114	39.6
5,000 - 9,999	42	14.6
10,000 - 19,999	20	6.9
20,000 and larger	30	10.4
Totals	288	100.0

Table 2
Approximate Age Range of Principal Respondents

Age Range	Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies %
25 and younger	0	0
26 - 30	7	2.4
31 - 35	52	18.1
36 - 40	51	17.1
41 - 45	44	15.3
46 - 50	64	22.2
51 and older	70	24.3
Totals	288	100.0

Table 3
Highest Level of Respondents' Educational Attainment

Attainment Level	Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies %
Bachelor's	0	0
Bachelor's +	0	0
Master's	26	9.0
Master's +	221	76.7
Specialist Degree	27	9.4
Doctorate	14	4.9
Totals	288	100.0

Professional Experience

Those surveyed were asked to indicate the approximate ranges corresponding to the amount of teaching and of administrative experience they possessed. The information is the subject of Table 4.

The average respondent reported that he/she had from six to ten years of teaching experience and a corresponding six to ten years of administrative experience.

Profile of the Average Respondent

The profile of the average respondent to the survey is as follows: Male, from a district of approximately 2,000 to 4,999 student population, approximately 41 to 45 years of age, has taught from six to ten years and has served as an administrator for six to ten years, possesses a Master's degree plus additional graduate hours beyond the Master's degree.

Collective Bargaining Characteristics of the Respondent's District

In order to address the research questions, those surveyed were asked several questions in regards to their perception of the status of collective bargaining in their respective districts.

Professional Negotiations Between Teachers and Boards of Education

Of those responding, 287 reported that teachers in their districts had formed a formal bargaining unit in the form of a teachers' association. Of these 287 respondents, 272 reported that the teachers actively engaged in professional negotiations with the board of education or its representatives. In short, 99.7% of the sample were

Table 4
 Respondents' Years of Teaching and Years of
 Administrative Experience

Years of Experience	Teaching Experience Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies %	Administrative Experience Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies %
0 - 5	76	26.4	54	18.8
6 - 10	117	40.6	95	33.0
11 - 15	65	22.6	71	24.7
16 - 20	18	6.3	43	14.9
21 - 25	8	2.8	20	6.9
26 - 30	2	0.7	4	1.4
31 or more	2	0.7	1	0.3
Totals	288	100.0	288	100.0

administrators in districts that had teachers'/education associations and 94.4% of the respondents served in districts where collective bargaining between these associations and the board of education have taken place.

Because of these data, it may be generalized that the vast majority of Ohio public school principals are readily exposed to professional negotiations between teachers and boards of education in some form. The data gathered from the survey also revealed that 96.2% (273) of the principals are not currently members of the local teachers' associations. Therefore, it may be further generalized that the vast majority of Ohio public school principals do not belong to local teachers' associations. This is not surprising given the evidence presented in the review of the literature that state and, subsequently, local teachers' association have invited administrators to withdraw from their organizations or have discouraged administrative membership in their organizations.

Administrative Bargaining Units

Some Ohio public school principals do, however, belong to administrative organizations formed at the local level for bargaining purposes. The survey revealed 24.3% (70) of the respondents declared that they served in districts with administrative bargaining units. That is, they served in districts where administrators, generally the principals, have formed an organization for the purpose of bargaining collectively with the board of education or its representatives. Of these 70 principals, 62 reported that they belonged to the administrative unit. Therefore, 21.5% of the sample belong to some form of

an administrative bargaining unit that is separate from the teachers' unit and that represents the administrative personnel of the district in some form of bargaining with the board of education or its representatives. While this was not one of the research questions being explored in this study, a significant relationship, $p < .05$, was discovered between the development of administrative units and the size of school districts. The data presented in Table 5 demonstrates this relationship.

The smaller the school district, the less the probability for that school district to have some form of administrative bargaining unit is the conclusion that can be drawn from the data presented in Table 5. For example: 55% of the principal respondents from districts with 10,000 to 19,999 and 70% of those principal respondents from districts 20,000 and larger student population reported that they serve in districts that have some form of administrative bargaining as opposed to smaller districts.

It may be noted here that several of the respondents may have been from the same school district. The larger the district the greater the number of principals in that district and, therefore, the greater the probability of more than one principal from that district being selected at random for the sample. However, since the sample was selected at random the results of this finding can be generalized to the target population, Ohio public school principals.

What the data regarding administrative bargaining units do not reveal is the nature of the bargaining. Do those districts that

Table 5

Administrative Units According to District Size

	District Size	2,000 & less	2,000 - 4,999	5,000 - 9,999	10,000 - 19,999	20,000 & larger	Raw Total
Administrative Bargaining Unit YES	Count	9	22	7	11	21	70
	Row Pct	12.9	31.4	10.0	15.7	30.0	
	Col Pct	11.0	19.3	16.7	55.0	70.0	
	Tot Pct	3.1	7.6	2.4	3.8	7.3	24.3
NO	Count	73	92	35	9	9	218
	Row Pct	33.5	42.2	16.1	4.1	4.1	
	Col Pct	89.0	80.7	83.3	45.0	30.0	
	Tot Pct	25.3	31.9	12.2	3.1	3.1	75.7
	Column Total	82	114	42	20	20	288
	Total	28.5%	39.6%	14.6%	6.9%	10.4%	100.0

$\chi^2 = 55.09412$; $df = 4$ $p < .05$

*There was no need to adjust these data by combining categories. All cells in every category contained 5 or more expected frequencies. Cochran (1954, pp. 417-451), McCollough (1963, p. 97) and Minimum (1970, p. 390), recommend that when more than 20% of all cells have expected frequencies of less than 5 combining categories is acceptable to control this and, thus, insure a reliable statistic.

have bargaining units for administrators engage in formal contractual agreement or do boards merely meet and confer with the administrators regarding administrative benefits and take action regarding their requests without a formal contract? This topic as well as the entire area of administrative bargaining needs to be the focus of further in-depth research.

Administrative Team Management

The respondents to the survey question inquiring as to the respondents' knowledge of the team management concept produced 52 "no knowledge" (18.1% of the sample) responses. The administrative organizations in Ohio: The Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators (OASSA), The Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators (OAESA), the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA--representing mostly superintendents and central office administrators), along with the Ohio School Boards Association (SBA), in 1978 endorsed and encouraged the team management concept as a method for effectively managing Ohio's schools. These organizations went to great lengths to publicize the concept and to inform school administrators about the concept. The publication, mentioned earlier, entitled The Management Team: A Recommended Approach for Operating Ohio's Public Schools was written and distributed by those organizations mentioned, and several others, to the general membership of these organizations. In addition, area workshops were held around the state to better familiarize school administrators with the concept. In light of the efforts by the various state organizations to enlighten their

memberships with respect to the team management idea, a review of the data in Table 6 is recommended.

Table 6 data present the responses of the sample to the question as to whether or not and to what degree they perceive team management is operational in their respective districts. These totals include those who are not familiar with the concept. Of those who were familiar with the concept, 91 responded that the concept was not operational, nor even being considered. When one combines the first three status categories in Table 6, 63.2% of the total respondents indicated that they are employed in districts where the team management concept is not yet operational, nor even in the implementation stages.

The data presented in Table 7 show the relationships between team management and district size. An analysis of the X^2 statistic regarding these two variables showed that there was no significant relationship ($X^2 = 16.46698$; $df = 16$ $P > .05$) between the status of team management and district size. However, upon examination, the data do appear to show that team management seems to be catching on to a greater degree in the moderate to smaller districts.

Only 15.6% of the respondents reported that team management is fully operational in their districts. It would appear, upon generalizing this data, that only about 16% of Ohio's public school principals are working in school districts where team management is perceived as operational and an additional 21% are employed in districts where this concept is perceived to be under implementation.

Table 6
The Status of Team Management in the Responding
Principals' Districts

Status	Absolute Frequencies N = 288	Relative Frequencies %
Respondent		
Not familiar with team management	52	18.1
Not operational - not being considered*	91	31.6
Not operational - under consideration*	31	13.5
Under implementation*	61	21.2
Fully operational*	45	15.6
Totals	288	100.0

*Respondents are familiar with team management

Table 7

Team Management According to District Size (Student Population)

Status of Team Management	District Size									
	under 2,000		2,000 - 4,999		5,000 - 9,999		10,000 - 19,999		20,000 & larger	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Respondent not familiar with team management	18	22.0	20	17.5	9	21.4	3	15.0	2	6.6
Not operational - Not being considered*	22	26.8	32	28.1	16	38.1	6	30.0	15	50.0
Not operational - Under consideration*	10	12.2	18	15.8	7	16.7	1	5.0	3	10.0
Under implementation*	18	22.0	27	23.7	5	11.9	6	30.0	5	16.7
Fully operational*	14	17.0	17	14.9	5	11.9	4	20.0	5	16.7
Totals	82	100.0	114	100.0	42	100.0	20	100.0	30	100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.46698$; $df = 16$ $p > .05$

*Respondents are familiar with team management.

**There was no need to combine categories to adjust the χ^2 for these data. Cochran (1954, pp. 417-451), McCollough (1963, p. 97), and Minimum (1970, p. 390) recommend combining when more than 20% of all cells contain expected frequencies of less than 5. Only 4 of the cells in this table had expected frequencies of less than 5. This is 16% and, thus, within acceptable limits.

It was not the purpose of this study to conduct in-depth research regarding administrative bargaining and team management. Thus, no provisions were made to further analyze the data concerning these areas beyond what has been presented here. However, these areas are obviously in need of further investigation to help clarify each concept and how they may interact upon one another.

The Roles of the Principal in Professional Negotiations

This dissertation was designed to investigate the perceived role of the Ohio public school principal in professional negotiations between teachers and the board of education. A review of the literature, discussions with those involved in professional negotiations in public schools and personal observations have revealed that principals may be involved in one of eight possible roles:

1. Principals, or a principal representing this administrative position, serve as members of the board of education negotiating team in actual teacher-board negotiation sessions. If this is the role of principals in a particular district then they will serve in at least one of the following positions:
 - A. Chief Negotiator
 - B. Negotiator (speaking member of the team)
 - C. Formal advisor (usually does not speak during negotiations but gives advice and opinions in caucus)
 - D. Observer (usually does not offer, nor is called on, to give advice or opinions during negotiations and

in caucus but is considered a board of education representative)

2. Principals do not sit at the table during actual negotiations but do serve in an informal advisory capacity to the board of education negotiating team. That is, principals, or a principal representing that administrative position meet with the superintendent or his/her representative and/or board members to assess the demands of the teacher negotiating team relative to the effects on school management and the educational program making recommendations to the superintendent or his/her representative and/or the board members concerning responses to these demands.
3. Principals serve as members of the teachers' negotiation team during actual bargaining sessions.
4. Principals do not sit at the table during actual negotiations but do serve in an informal advisory capacity to the teachers' negotiating team. That is, principals or a principal representing that administrative position, meet with the teachers' negotiators to advise them in the preparation of positions that may effect school management and the educational program and/or to make recommendations concerning these positions.
5. Principals serve as neutral consultants to both the board of education and the teachers during negotiations. That

is, they do not sit at the table during actual negotiations but act as resource persons providing information to both parties upon request.

6. Principals serve as neutral observers at the table during negotiations. They do not participate in actual bargaining but rather they serve as resource persons providing information when called upon, to both parties.
7. Principals are not involved in any manner in professional negotiations between boards of education and teachers.
8. Principals may possibly be involved in some other role than those previously listed. Respondents were asked to elaborate on this role if none of the foregoing positions represented or even closely approximated the role principals have in professional negotiations in their district.

Analysis of the Research Questions

Research Question 1

What do principals perceive as their actual role in professional negotiations?

The data included in Table 8 give a quick overview of the perceived roles by the principals sampled. That is, these choices are the perceptions that the respondents hold regarding the role principals have in their districts.

A total of 54.5% of the sample reported that principals in their district serve as members of the boards' negotiating team during actual board-teacher negotiations. The next most prevalent identification was Role 7--principals are not involved in any manner in

Table 8
 Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by
 the Respondents*

Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Totals
Absolute Frequency	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
Relative Frequency	54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

*Role 1 Principals serve as members of boards' team at negotiation's table

Role 2 Principals serve as informal advisors to boards' team away from table

Role 3 Principals serve as members of teachers' team at table

Role 4 Principals are informal advisors to teachers away from table

Role 5 Principals are neutral consultants to both the board and teachers away from table

Role 6 Principals are neutral observers at table

Role 7 Principals are not involved in any manner in professional negotiations

Role 8 Principals involved in another role other than described above

professional negotiations between boards of education and teachers. This was followed by Role 2--principals do not sit at the negotiations table during negotiations, but do serve in an advisory capacity to the board of education negotiating team away from the table in meetings designed to gain input from the principals. Therefore, 68% of the respondents are associated with a role that has them serving in a management capacity in professional negotiations. Roles 3 through 6 and Role 8 accounted for only 7.6% of all the principals perceptions. Thus, 92.4% of all of those sampled identified Roles 1 (54.5%), Role 2 (13.5%) and Role 7 (24.3%) as indications of the roles that the principals perceived principals in their districts have with respect to professional negotiations.

The failure of principals to select Roles 3 and 4 is not too surprising given that most principals are not associated with teachers' associations but are generally considered management persons in most districts. Both of the principals who identified Role 3--principals serve as members of the teachers' negotiation team during actual bargaining, came from districts under 2,000 student population. It may be that they serve in districts where they are not full time principals but serve as principal/teacher and still belong to the teachers' association. The person selecting Role 4 came from a district in the 2,000-4,999 student population category--also a smaller district. An analysis of district size and principals' choices will be made later.

Research Question 2

Are there differences between perceptions of elementary and secondary school principals?

As shown by the data in Table 9, no significant differences were found in principals' perceptions of the role principals in their district have regarding professional negotiations based on their position as either an elementary or a secondary principal. That is, elementary and secondary principals did not differ significantly in their perceptions of the roles principals in their respective district had with respect to professional negotiations. It was felt by some of the principals who provided advice regarding the construction of the survey that secondary and elementary principals may differ in their perceptions of the roles principals have in professional negotiations. They felt that secondary principals may perceive a more active role than elementary principals.

Research Question 3

Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to district size?

An analysis of this question using the chi-square statistic showed that a significant relationship between the roles identified by the respondents and the district size did not exist at the .05 level and below. That is, there were not significant differences in roles based on district size. However, analysis of the role identifications does reveal some interesting points. Of those identifying Role 7--no involvement in professional negotiations--75.7% came from

Table 9

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by
Elementary and Secondary Principals

Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total	
Elementary	Count	79	20	0	1	3	2	30	7	142
Principal	Row Pct	55.6	14.1	0	0.7	2.1	1.4	21.1	4.9	
	Col Pct	50.3	51.3	0	100.0	75.0	28.6	42.9	87.5	
	Tot Pct	27.4	6.9	0	0.3	1.0	0.7	10.4	2.4	49.3
Secondary	Count	78	19	2	0	1	5	40	1	146
Principal	Row Pct	53.4	13.0	1.4	0	0.7	3.4	27.4	0.7	
	Col Pct	49.7	48.7	100.0	0	25.0	71.4	57.1	12.5	
	Tot Pct	27.1	6.6	0.7	0	0.3	1.7	13.9	0.3	50.7
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
		54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 11.19290$; $df = 7$ $p > .05$

For an explanation of Roles, see page 65.

the smaller districts. This would lead one to believe that principals in moderate to larger districts may have more involvement in professional negotiations. Of all respondents from districts under 2,000, 82, almost 30%, did not perceive that principals in their district were involved in professional negotiations in any manner. The lowest percentage of perceived noninvolvement came from the respondents from the 10,000 to 19,999 size category, only 1.4% of principals in this category perceived noninvolvement whereas, 90% in this category perceived that principals were involved as either formal (70%) or informal (20%) members of the boards' team during actual board-teacher negotiations. These are Roles 1 and 2 respectively. These data are presented in Table 10.

Research Question 4

Are there differences between the perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an avowed team management concept and those who reported their district has no such avowed concept?

To collect data pertaining to this research question, those surveyed were asked if they were familiar with the team management approach recently recommended by the state administrative organizations as the most suitable method for operating Ohio's public schools. Of the respondents, 236 or 81.9% stated that they were familiar with this approach, 52 or 18.1% indicated that they were not familiar with the concept.

Table 10

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles by Elementary
and Secondary Principals (Adjusted X_2 - Observed
and Expected Frequencies)

Roles	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Elementary Principal	79	77	20	19	30	35	13	11	142
Secondary Principal	78	80	19	20	40	35	9	11	146
Column Totals - O	157		39		70		22		288

$X_2 = 2.36042$; $df = 3$ $p > .05$

*Adjusted X_2 - Categories 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 were combined to create a single category since the expected frequencies in the cells in each of these categories were less than 5. Combining is recommended by Cochran (1954), McCollough (1963), and Minimum (1970) as an acceptable method of providing strength and reliability to the X_2 test. No more than 20% of all cells may contain an expected frequency of less than 5. After adjustment, no cells in the table contain expected frequencies of less than 5.

**O = Observed Frequencies
E = Expected Frequencies

As previously reported, those who indicated that they were familiar with team management were asked to give their perceptions of the status of this concept in their district. There were four status choices: (a) not currently in operation, and not being considered; (b) not currently in operation but under serious consideration; (c) currently undergoing implementation; (d) currently in full operation. Table 6 contains data regarding the status of team management in the respondents' districts. The data in Table 11 reveal that a significant difference does exist at the .05 level between the perceptions of those who responded that they have no such concept in their district and those who responded that they do, or soon will, operate under team management.

The data show that the respondents from districts that have or are moving toward team management have a greater propensity to select Role 1, direct involvement, than those who are employed in districts where there is no team management reported. That is, 45.1% of those who reported that team management was not operational, nor being considered in their district perceived Role 1 as opposed to 73.3% who reported team management under full operation in their district. Conversely, those who reported the greatest noninvolvement, Role 7, were those who reported that team management was not operational, nor under consideration in their districts. Based on the data, it appears that those districts that are operating under a team management concept or are moving toward such a concept have a significantly larger degree of direct principal involvement in actual professional

Table 11

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to District Size (Student Population)

Size	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	33	16	2	0	2	0	24	5	82
Under	Row Pct	Pct	40.2	19.5	2.4	0	2.4	0	29.3	6.1
2,000	Col Pct	21.0	41.0	100.0	0	50.0	0	34.3	62.5	
	Tot Pct	11.5	5.6	0.7	0	0.7	0	8.3	1.7	28.5
	Count	63	11	0	1	2	6	29	2	114
2,000 -	Row Pct	55.3	9.6	0	0.9	1.8	5.3	25.4	1.8	
4,999	Col Pct	40.1	28.2	0	100.0	50.0	85.7	41.4	25.0	
	Tot Pct	21.9	3.8	0	0.3	0.7	2.1	10.1	0.7	39.6
	Count	29	3	0	0	0	0	9	1	42
5,000 -	Row Pct	69.0	7.1	0	0	0	0	21.4	2.4	
9,999	Col Pct	18.5	7.7	0	0	0	0	12.9	12.5	
	Tot Pct	10.1	1.0	0	0	0	0	3.1	0.3	14.6

Table 11 (continued)

Size	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	14	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	20
10,000 -	Row Pct	70.0	20.0	0	0	0	5.0	5.0	0	
19,999	Col Pct	8.9	10.3	0	0	0	14.3	1.4	0	
	Tot Pct	4.9	1.4	0	0	0	0.3	0.3	0	6.9
	Count	18	5	0	0	0	0	7	0	30
20,000 &	Row Pct	60.0	16.7	0	0	0	0	23.3	0	
larger	Col Pct	11.5	12.8	0	0	0	0	10.0	0	
	Tot Pct	6.3	1.7	0	0	0	0	2.4	0	10.4
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
		54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 37.13123$; $df = 28$ $p > .05$

For definition of Roles see page 65

negotiations as members of the board's team. Conversely, it appears that those districts that have the largest degree of noninvolvement in professional negotiations by principals have not adopted a team management concept.

To further bolster this appearance, it was found that a highly significant relationship exists between those who are familiar with team management and role perception. The data provided in Table 12 show that those who are familiar with team management have the highest involvement in professional negotiations and those who are not familiar have the highest degree of noninvolvement. Since the respondents who reported that they are not familiar with team management in all probability are in districts that are not operating under such an avowed concept, this finding would tend to agree with the finding from the data in Table 11.

Research Question 5

Are there differences between perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an administrative bargaining unit and those that reported that their district had no administrative bargaining unit?

It was noted earlier during the discussion of the collective bargaining characteristics of the respondents' districts that a significant relationship, $P < .05$, was found to exist between the formation of administrative bargaining units and district size in that larger districts have a greater propensity to form such units than smaller districts (see Table 5). This research question is aimed at determining

Table 12

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to District Size (Student Population) (Adjusted X_2 -
Observed and Expected Frequencies)

Role Size	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Under 2,000	33	45	16	11	24	20	9	6	82
2,000 - 4,999	63	62	11	15	29	28	11	9	114
5,000 - 9,999	29	23	3	6	9	10	1	3	42
Over 10,000	32	27	9	7	8	12	1	4	50
Column Totals Observed Frequencies	157		39		70		22		288

$X_2 = 15.91492$; $df = 9$ $p > .05$

*Adjusted X_2 - Roles 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were combined into a single category since the cells in those categories had less than 5 for expected frequencies. Combining is recommended by Cochran (1954), McCollough (1963) and Minimum (1970) when more than 20% of all cells contain less than 5. After combining, only 12.5% (2) cells contain expected frequencies of less than 5 and thus within acceptable limits.

**O = Observed Frequencies
E = Expected Frequencies

if the respondents perceive that principals in their district have different roles in professional negotiations depending on whether or not their district has an administrative bargaining unit.

The data presented in Table 13 reveal that there is not a significant difference between the perceptions of principals who serve in districts with administrative bargaining units and those who do not. That is, there was no significant statistical difference between those frequencies observed for each role and those expected based on administrative bargaining unit existence in the respondents' districts.

Research Question 6

Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to the number of years of teaching experience they had and according to the length of their administrative experience?

This question concerns the experience of the respondent and the relationship, if any, his/her teaching and administrative experience may have upon their perceptions of the roles principals may have in their districts regarding professional negotiations. It was felt that the longer a respondent had taught or, conversely, been an administrator the more this may color his/her perceptions of the role principals had in the district in which they were employed.

The data in Tables 14 and 15 indicate that these variables do not significantly relate to the perceived roles beyond what can be statistically expected according to analysis by the chi-square statistic.

Table 13

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to the Status
of Team Management in the Respondents' Districts

Status	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
Not operational not considered	Count	41	11	1	0	3	3	30	2	91
	Row Pct	45.1	12.1	1.1	0	3.3	33.0	33.0	2.2	
	Col Pct	30.4	30.6	50.0	0	75.0	60.0	61.2	40.0	
	Tot Pct	17.4	4.7	0.4	0	1.3	1.3	12.7	0.8	38.6
Not operational under con- sideration	Count	21	8	0	0	0	0	9	1	39
	Row Pct	53.8	2.05	0	0	0	0	23.1	2.6	
	Col Pct	15.8	22.2	0	0	0	0	18.4	20.0	
	Tot Pct	8.9	3.4	0	0	0	0	3.8	0.4	16.5
Under implemen- tation	Count	40	13	1	0	1	1	4	1	61
	Row Pct	65.6	21.3	1.6	0	1.6	1.6	6.6	1.6	
	Col Pct	29.6	36.1	50.0	0	25.0	20.0	8.2	20.0	
	Tot Pct	16.9	5.5	0.4	0	0.4	0.4	1.7	0.4	25.8

Table 13 (continued)

Status	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	33	4	0	0	0	1	6	1	45
Full	Row Pct	73.3	8.9	0	0	0	2.2	13.3	2.2	
Operation	Tot Pct	14.0	1.7	0	0	0	0.4	2.5	0.4	19.1
	Column	135	36	2	0	4	5	49	5	236
	Totals	57.2	15.3	0.8	0	1.7	2.1	20.8	2.1	100.0

$\chi^2 = 28.87138$; $df = 18$ $p < .05$

For definition of Roles see page 65.

Table 14

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to the Status of Team Management in the Respondents'
Districts (Adjusted X_2 - Observed and
Expected Frequencies)

Roles	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Not operational not considered	41	52	11	13	30	19	9	6	91
Not operational under consideration	21	22	8	6	9	8	1	3	39
Under implementation	40	34	13	9	4	12	4	4	61
Full operation	33	25	4	7	6	9	2	3	45
Observed Frequencies Column Total	135		36		49		16		236 100.0

$X_2 = 26.02247$; $df = 9$ $p < .05$

*Adjusted X_2 - Frequencies for roles 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were combined into category "others". Combining is recommended by Cochran (1954), McCollough (1963), and Minimum (1970) when expected frequencies in more than 20% of all cells less than 5. Only three cells (20%) contain expected frequencies of less than 5. This is within acceptable limits of 20%

**O = Observed Frequencies
E = Expected Frequencies

Table 15

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to Respondents' Knowledge of Team Concept

Familiar	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
YES	Count	134	36	2	1	4	5	49	5	236
	Row Pct	56.8	15.3	0.8	0.4	1.7	2.1	20.8	2.1	
	Col Pct	85.4	92.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	71.4	70.0	62.5	
	Tot Pct	46.5	12.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	1.7	17.0	1.7	81.9
NO	Count	23	3	0	0	0	2	21	3	52
	Row Pct	44.2	5.8	0	0	0	3.8	40.4	5.8	
	Col Pct	14.6	7.7	0	0	0	28.6	30.0	27.8	
	Tot Pct	8.0	1.0	0	0	0	0.7	7.3	37.5	18.1
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
	Totals	54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 14.92165$; $df = 7$ $p < .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Research Question 7

Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to their level of educational attainment?

As in research question 6, this question sought to discover if a significant relationship existed between a demographic variable level of educational attainment of the respondent (degree) and the perception (choice) of roles by the respondents. It was thought that the number of years of teaching experience and the number of years as administrator may color the perception of the respondents. It was likewise felt that the level of academic achievement may, to some degree, relate to the perceptions of the respondents regarding the role principals have in their districts during professional negotiations.

Indeed, while these questions were not based on any previous empirical evidence, and no evidence was found regarding teaching and administrative experience in the previous question, an interesting relationship has appeared in the data. This statistically significant relationship was found to exist between the perceived role and the level of educational attainment of the respondents (see Table 16). This relationship indicates that the higher the degree level of academic preparation of the respondent the more directly involved the respondent perceives principals in his/her district are in actual board-teacher negotiations as a member of the boards' team as per Role 1. The lower the degree level the more uninvolved, Role 7, or indirectly involved, Role 2, the respondent perceives principals in his/her district to be in the negotiations process.

Table 16

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to Respondents' Knowledge of Team Concept (Adjusted
 X_2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)

Roles Familiar	1		3		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Yes	134	128	36	32	49	57	17	18	236
No	23	28	3	7	21	13	5	4	52
Observed Frequencies Column Totals	157		39		70		22		288 100.0

$X_2 = 10.31126$; $df = 3$ $p < .05$

*Adjusted X_2 - Frequencies for roles 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were combined into category "others". Combining is recommended when the expected frequencies in more than 20% of all cells is less than 5. Only one cell (12.5%) after adjustment contains frequencies of less than 5. This is within the acceptable limits of 20%.

**O = Observed Frequencies

E = Expected Frequencies

Analysis of the Roles

Following is an analysis of the roles a principal can serve in regarding professional negotiations in his/her district. The responses of those surveyed with respect to their perceptions of the role principals have in their district are presented ranging from Role 1--full involvement as a negotiating team member, to Role 8--the district does not engage in professional negotiations.

Role 1 - Member of Boards' Team .

This role is representative of districts where principals, or a representative principal, serve as members of the board of education negotiating team in actual teacher-board bargaining sessions. As shown by the data presented in Table 8, this role was selected by the greatest percentage of the respondents, 54.5%, as being reflective of the role principals in their districts have in the bargaining process.

There are four possible positions that principals can have as a member of the board negotiating team:

1. Chief negotiator - the chief spokesperson for the board team during bargaining sessions.
2. Negotiator - a speaking member of the boards' team but not the chief spokesperson.
3. Formal advisor - does not speak during actual bargaining but gives advice and opinions during caucus.
4. Observer - usually does not offer to give advice or opinions during negotiations not in caucus, but merely

observes the proceedings as a representative of the district's principals and as a member of the board's team.

Of those responding to Role 1, 157 respondents, only 1.9% indicated that principals serve as chief negotiators in their districts. Those reporting that "negotiator"--speaking member of the team--is most representative of their district amounted to 29.9%; "formal advisor"--non-speaking member of the team--was 54.8%; "observer"--does not speak in negotiations or in caucus--was 12.1%; none selected "other" as the position principals serve in during negotiations. Those reporting "don't know" amounted to 1.3% of the responses.

As can be seen, by far the most common position principals have when serving as members of the boards' team during negotiating is that of formal advisor.

Role 2 - Advisor to Boards' Team

Principals selecting this role as being reflective of the role principals have in their district, 39 or 13.5% of all respondents, were indicating that principals in their district do not sit at the table during actual negotiations but do serve in an informal advisory capacity to the board negotiating team in meetings with the superintendent or his/her representative and/or board members. The purpose of these meetings is to assess the demands of the teachers' team relative to the effects on school management and the educational program. At these meetings the principals, or their representative, make recommendations to the boards' team concerning responses to the teachers' demands.

The respondents who identified Role 2 indicated that 20.5% of them have regular meetings during the period of negotiations and therefore, have regular input into the proceedings. Of those that responded, 7.7% indicated that they meet only once, at the beginning of negotiations. The largest percentage 59.0% responded that in their districts, they do not meet on a regular basis but just periodically during the negotiations process. Only 2.6% indicated that they meet only during a crisis situation regarding negotiations. Two respondents, 5.1%, responded that they meet at the beginning of negotiations and just before an anticipated ratification by the teachers. Two responded that they did not know when principals in their districts meet with the board in an informal advisory capacity.

Role 3 - Member of Teachers' Team and
Role 4 - Advisor to Teachers' Team

Only two respondents reported that principals or a principal's representative serve as members of the teachers' negotiations team during actual bargaining sessions. This represents only 0.7% of all respondents. When coupled with Role 4, where principals serve as informal advisors to the teachers' team, as per principals and boards' team in Role 2, this represents approximately 1.0% of all respondents. Neither of the respondents to Role 3 responded to the other portions of selection regarding membership of the principals in the teachers' unit and the status of that membership with respect to elementary and secondary principals. The failure of these respondents to complete all of the information asked under Role 3 may cast doubt on the validity of these responses.

Role 5 - Neutral Consultant at Table and
Role 6 - Neutral Consultant Away from Table

Role 5 respondents were reporting that principals in their districts serve as neutral consultants to both the boards' team and the teachers' team away from the table during negotiations. That is, they are resource persons for both groups when needed as such.

Role 6 differs slightly in that principals in these districts sit at the table as neutral observers and do not participate in bargaining unless called upon by both parties to provide information as resource persons.

Role 5 was chosen by 1.4% of all respondents (four principals) as being indicative of the role of principals in their districts while 2.4% (seven principals) selected Role 6.

Role 7 - Noninvolvement

Of all respondents, 24.3% chose Role 7--noninvolvement in board-teacher negotiations--as being reflective of principals in their district. This was despite their reporting that board-teacher bargaining exists in their districts.

Role 8 - Other Roles

Eight respondents indicated that teachers in their districts did not engage in any form of formal professional negotiations with the board. Therefore, the principal had no role in a bargaining process. This accounted for 2.8% of all respondents.

Generalizations

Because of the random selection of the sample, it can be generalized that these responses are indicative of the roles Ohio public

school elementary and secondary principals have regarding professional negotiations between boards and teachers.

Analysis of Respondents' Satisfaction With Role

The final question asked of respondents was whether or not they, as individuals, were satisfied with the role of the principal in collective negotiations between the board of education and teachers in their district. In addition, they were asked to indicate whether or not they would change the role and if so, in what manner.

The respondents' replies to this question, satisfied or not satisfied, were examined using the chi-square statistic to see if any significant relationships occurred between their responses and selected variables.

Significant relationships were found to exist between the respondents' comments regarding satisfaction and the identification of roles that principals have in their district, and between satisfaction and the perceived status of team management in their districts. No significant relationships were found to exist between satisfaction and: district size; position as elementary or secondary principal; age; sex; status of teachers' associations and whether or not the principals were members of the association; educational level of the respondent; teaching experience of the respondents; administrative experience of the respondent; the existence of an administrative bargaining unit in the respondent's district and whether or not the respondent was a member of this unit and knowledge of team management.

The data presented in Table 17 describe the significant relationship between the respondents' role and satisfaction with that role, that is, the role they perceive principals in their district as serving with regard to professional negotiations and whether or not they themselves (the respondents) were satisfied with that role. One caveat here, this satisfaction is indicative only of the respondent and does not necessarily reflect whether or not other principals in the respondent's district was satisfied with this role.

From the data, it appears that the most satisfied group, 41.7% of all respondents, 63.4 of all those reporting role satisfaction, are from districts where principals serve as members of the boards' team during actual negotiations. When these data are combined with the data from Role 2, formal advisor to the boards' team, which is another management role, one-half or 50.7% of all respondents are satisfied with these roles and 77.1% of all those satisfied serve in districts where the principal is in a management role during professional negotiations. Therefore, a statistically significant relationship between role satisfaction and management oriented roles appears to exist. Of those satisfied with their role, 18.3% reported that principals in their district do not have a role in professional negotiations as per Role 7.

The data presented in Table 18 indicate a significant relationship exists between role satisfaction and the status of team management in the respondents' districts. The data clearly show that the principals who work in districts which have or are moving toward

Table 17

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to Administrative Bargaining Units

Adm. Bargaining Units	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
YES	Count	37	14	0	1	0	2	16	0	70
	Row Pct	52.9	20.0	0	1.4	0	2.9	22.9	0	
	Col Pct	23.6	35.9	0	100.0	0	28.6	22.9	0	
	Tot Pct	12.8	4.9	0	0.3	0	0.7	5.6	0	24.3
NO	Count	120	25	2	0	4	5	54	8	218
	Row Pct	55.0	11.5	0.9	0	1.8	2.3	24.8	3.7	
	Col Pct	76.4	64.1	100.0	0	100.0	71.4	77.1	100.0	
	Tot Pct	41.7	8.7	0.7	0	1.4	1.7	18.8	2.8	75.7

$\chi^2 = 10.65372$; $df = 7$ $p > .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Table 18
 Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
 to Administrative Bargaining Units (Adjusted
 χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)

Roles Administrative Bargaining Units	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Yes	37	38	14	9	16	17	3	5	70
No	120	118	25	30	54	53	19	17	218
Observed Frequencies Column Totals	157		39		70		22		288 100.0

$\chi^2 = 4.78431$; $df = 3$ $p < .05$

*Adjusted χ^2 - Roles 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were combined into a single category "others". Combining is recommended when more than 20% of all cells contain expected frequencies of less than 5.

**O = Observed Frequencies
 E = Expected Frequencies

Table 19

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to Respondents' Teaching Experience

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
0 - 5	Count	42	13	1	1	0	2	15	2	76
	Row Pct	55.3	17.1	1.3	1.3	0	2.6	19.7	2.6	
	Col Pct	26.8	33.3	50.0	100.0	0	28.6	21.4	25.0	
	Tot Pct	14.6	4.5	0.3	0.3	0	0.7	5.2	0.7	26.4
6 - 10	Count	71	14	1	0	1	3	24	3	117
	Row Pct	60.7	12.0	0.9	0	0.9	2.6	20.5	2.6	
	Col Pct	45.2	35.9	50.0	0	25.0	42.9	34.3	37.5	
	Tot Pct	24.7	4.9	0.3	0	0.3	1.0	8.3	1.0	40.6
11 - 15	Count	29	12	0	0	2	1	19	2	65
	Row Pct	44.6	18.5	0	0	3.1	1.5	29.2	3.1	
	Col Pct	18.5	30.8	0	0	50.0	14.3	27.1	25.0	
	Tot Pct	10.1	4.2	0	0	0.7	0.3	6.6	0.7	22.6

Table 19 (continued)

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
16 - 20	Count	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	18
	Row Pct	50.0	0	0	0	5.6	0	44.4	0	
	Col Pct	5.7	0	0	0	25.0	0	11.4	0	
	Tot Pct	3.1	0	0	0	0.3	0	2.8	0	6.3
21 - 25	Count	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	8
	Row Pct	37.5	0	0	0	0	0	50.0	12.5	
	Col Pct	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	5.7	12.5	
	Tot Pct	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	0.3	2.8
26 - 30	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Row Pct	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Col Pct	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Tot Pct	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7

Table 19 (continued)

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
31 and over	Row Pct	50.0	0	0	0	0	50.0	0	0	
	Col Pct	0.6	0	0	0	0	14.3	0	0	
	Tot Pct	0.3	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.7
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
	Totals	54.5	13.5	2.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 49.42093$; $df = 42$ $p > .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Table 20
 Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
 to Respondents' Teaching Experience (Adjusted
 χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)

Roles Years of Experience	1		2		7		Others		Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
0 - 5	42	41	13	10	15	18	6	6	76
6 - 10	71	64	14	16	24	28	8	9	117
11 - 15	29	35	12	9	19	16	5	5	65
Over 15	15	16	0	4	12	7	3	2	30
Column Totals	157		39		70		22		288

$\chi^2 = 13.84755$; $df = 9$ $p > .05$

*Adjusted χ^2 - The following categories containing a majority of cells having expected frequencies of less than 5 were combined as recommended by Cochran (1954), McCollough (1963), and Minimum (1970) to create categories with cells of 5 or more and thus leaving no more than 20% of all cells with expected frequencies of less than 5. Only 2 cells contain expected frequencies of less than 5. This is 12.5% and falls within acceptable limits.

Categories Combined: Roles 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8
 Years of Experience - 16-20, 21-25, 26-30 and
 31 and over

**O = Observed Frequencies
 E = Expected Frequencies

Table 21

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to
Respondents' Administrative Experience

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
0 - 5	Count	34	3	1	0	0	0	15	0	54
	Row Pct	63.0	5.6	1.9	0	0	0	27.8	1.9	
	Col Pct	21.7	7.7	50.0	0	0	0	21.4	12.5	
	Tot Pct	11.8	1.0	0.3	0	0	0	5.2	0.3	18.8
6 - 10	Count	44	14	0	1	2	2	29	3	95
	Row Pct	46.3	14.7	0	1.1	2.1	2.1	30.5	3.2	
	Col Pct	28.0	35.9	0	100.0	50.0	28.6	41.4	37.5	
	Tot Pct	15.3	4.9	0	0.3	0.7	0.7	10.1	1.0	33.0
11 - 15	Count	42	12	0	0	0	1	13	3	71
	Row Pct	59.2	16.9	0	0	0	1.4	18.3	4.2	
	Col Pct	26.8	30.8	0	0	0	14.3	18.6	37.5	
	Tot Pct	14.6	4.2	0	0	0	0.3	4.5	1.0	24.7

Table 21 (continued)

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
16 - 20	Count	25	7	0	0	1	3	7	0	43
	Row Pct	58.1	16.3	0	0	2.3	7.0	16.3	0	
	Col Pct	15.9	17.9	0	0	25.0	42.9	10.0	0	
	Tot Pct	8.7	2.4	0	0	0.3	1.0	2.4	0	14.9
21 - 25	Count	11	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	20
	Row Pct	55.0	15.0	5.0	0	0	5.0	15.0	5.0	
	Col Pct	7.0	7.7	50.0	0	0	14.3	4.3	12.5	
	Tot Pct	3.8	1.0	0.3	0	0	0.3	1.0	0.3	6.9
26 - 30	Count	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
	Row Pct	25.0	0	0	0	25.0	0	50.0	0	
	Col Pct	0.6	0	0	0	25.0	0	2.9	0	
	Tot Pct	0.3	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.7	0	1.4

Table 21 (continued)

Years of Experience	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
31 and over	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Row Pct	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0	
	Col Pct	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	0	
	Tot Pct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	0	0.3
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
		54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 52.78093$; $df = 42$ $p > .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Table 22
 Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
 to Respondents' Administrative Experience (Adjusted
 χ^2 - Observed and Expected Frequencies)

Roles Years of Experience	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
0 - 5	34	29	3	7	15	13	2	4	54
6 - 10	44	52	14	13	29	23	8	7	95
11 - 15	42	39	12	10	13	17	4	5	71
Over 15	37	33	10	6	13	10	8	5	43
Observed Frequencies Column Totals	157		39		70		22		288

$\chi^2 = 15.09470$; $df = 9$ $p > .05$

*Adjusted χ^2 - The same categories combined in Table 14 were combined in this table to provide for better reliability of the χ^2 statistics. Combining is recommended by Cochran (1954), McCollough (1967), and Minimum (1970). Only one (1) cell (6%) had a frequency of less than 5. This is within the 20% limit of acceptability.

**O = Observed Frequencies
 E = Expected Frequencies

Table 23

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According to
Respondents' Level of Educational Attainment

Degree Level	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	13	3	2	0	0	0	8	0	26
	Row Pct	50.0	11.5	7.7	0	0	0	30.8	0	
	Col Pct	8.3	7.7	100.0	0	0	0	11.4	0	
	Tot Pct	4.5	1.0	0.7	0	0	0	2.8	0	9.0
	Count	115	33	0	1	4	7	56	5	221
	Row Pct	52.0	14.9	0	0.5	1.8	3.2	25.3	2.3	
	Col Pct	73.2	84.6	0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	62.5	
	Tot Pct	39.9	11.5	0	0.3	1.4	2.4	19.4	1.7	76.7
	Count	20	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	27
	Row Pct	74.1	7.4	0	0	0	0	11.1	7.4	
	Col Pct	12.7	5.1	0	0	0	0	4.3	25.0	
	Tot Pct	6.9	0.7	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.7	9.4

Table 23 (continued)

Degree Level	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
	Count	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	14
	Row Pct	64.3	7.1	0	0	0	0	21.4	7.1	
	Col Pct	5.7	2.6	0	0	0	0	4.3	12.5	
	Tot Pct	3.1	0.3	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.3	4.9
	Column Totals	157	39	2	1	4	7	70	8	288
		54.5	13.5	0.7	0.3	1.4	2.4	24.3	2.8	100.0

$\chi^2 = 34.34689$; $df = 21$ $p < .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Table 24

Identification of Perceived Negotiation Roles According
to Respondents' Level of Educational Attainment
(Adjusted X^2 - Observed and Expected
Frequencies)

Roles Degree Level	1		2		7		Others		Observed Frequencies Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
M. A.	13	14	3	4	8	6	2	2	26
M. A. +	115	120	33	30	56	43	17	16	221
EDS	29	22	3	6	6	10	4	5	41
Observed Frequencies Column Totals	157		39		70		70		288

$X^2 = 13.01643$; $df = 6$ $p < .05$

*Adjusted X^2 - The following categories were combined into a single category because the majority of cells in those categories contained expected frequencies of less than 5. No more than 20% of all cells may contain expected frequencies of less than 5 for the X^2 to be reliable. Only 2 cells in the adjusted table contain expected frequencies of less than 5. This is 17% and is within the 20% acceptable limit.

Combined categories: Roles 3, 4, 5, and 8
Degree levels - EDS and Ph. D.

**O = Observed Frequencies
E = Expected Frequencies

Table 25

Role Satisfaction of Respondents by Perceived
Role in Professional Negotiations

Status	Role	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Row Total
Satisfied	Count	83	18	0	0	1	1	24	4	131
	Row Pct	63.4	13.7	0	0	0.8	0.8	18.3	3.1	
	Col Pct	74.8	62.1	0	0	50.0	25.0	50.0	80.0	
	Tot Pct	41.7	9.0	0	0	0.5	0.5	12.1	2.0	65.8
Not Satisfied	Count	28	11	0	0	1	3	24	1	68
	Row Pct	41.2	16.2	0	0	1.5	4.4	35.3	1.5	
	Col Pct	25.2	37.9	0	0	50.0	75.0	50.0	20.0	
	Tot Pct	14.1	5.5	0	0	0.5	1.5	12.1	0.5	34.2

$\chi^2 = 13.11125$; $df = 5$ $p < .05$

For definition of Roles, see page 65.

Table 26
 Role Satisfaction of Respondents by Perceived Role in
 Professional Negotiations (Adjusted X^2 - Observed
 and Expected Frequencies)

Roles Status	1		2		7		Others		Row Total
	O	E	O	E	O	E	O	E	
Satisfied	83	73	18	19	24	32	6	7	131
Not Satisfied	28	28	11	10	24	16	5	4	68
Observed Frequencies Column Totals	111		29		48		11		199

$X^2 = 10.54693$; $df = 3$ $p < .05$

*Adjusted X^2 - Categories (Roles) 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 were combined because each contained a majority of cells with expected frequencies of less than 5. Only 1 cell (12.5%) was found to contain less than 5 expected frequencies. This falls within the 20% acceptable limit.

**O = Observed Frequency
 E = Expected Frequency

Table 27

Role Satisfaction of Respondents According to the Status
of Team Management in Respondents' Districts

Team Management Status		Satisfied*	Not Satisfied*	Row Total
	Count	28	38	66
Not operational -	Row Pct	42.4	57.6	
Not under	Col Pct	25.9	63.3	
consideration	Tot Pct	16.7	22.6	39.3
	Count	22	4	26
Not operational -	Row Pct	84.6	15.4	
Under consideration	Col Pct	20.4	6.7	
	Tot Pct	13.1	2.4	15.5
	Count	30	14	44
Under	Row Pct	68.2	31.8	
Implementation	Col Pct	27.8	23.3	
	Tot Pct	17.9	8.3	26.2
	Count	28	4	32
Full	Row Pct	87.5	12.5	
Operational	Col Pct	25.9	6.7	
	Tot Pct	16.7	2.4	19.0
	Column Totals	108 64.3	60 35.7	168 100.0

$\chi^2 = 26.22107$; $df = 3$ $p < .05$

*Refers to satisfaction of respondent with the role principals have in professional negotiations in the district in which they are employed.
**The expected frequencies for all cells in this table are 5 or greater, thus, no adjustments (combining) are necessary.

team management are more satisfied with their roles than those who work in districts that do not have team management and are not considering team management.

Presentation and Analysis of Respondents' Comments

Many of the respondents chose to make open-ended comments regarding the role principals have in the bargaining process in their districts in a space provided on the questionnaire for that purpose. Most of these comments were responses to whether or not they were satisfied with this role. Most respondents chose only to make brief "yes" or "no" responses to this question with no further comment being made. Also, some respondents chose to make unsolicited responses regarding team management. These will be presented and discussed in addition to the solicited comments.

The respondents were asked the following questions: Please indicate whether or not you are satisfied with the role of the principal in collective negotiations with teachers in your district. Also, indicate whether or not you would change this role. If so, how would you change it and why would you change it. You may also use this space to voice your opinions regarding the role of the principal in professional negotiations.

As previously stated, many chose not to respond or only to make minimal responses, i.e., yes or no, to this question. However, 92 of the respondents did make comments of a more elaborate nature. These, for the most part, will be presented and discussed. The intent here is not to statistically analyze these comments but merely to present

them as reflections of how some of the respondents feel about their role in professional negotiations. It is felt that these comments may be of assistance to others in research planning.

Satisfied With Role

Those who indicated satisfaction, 31 in all, with their role made fewer elaborate responses than those who were not satisfied. One respondent merely stated, "As long as the option is mine--to serve or not to serve (on the boards' team during negotiations)--I have no objections."

Of those satisfied respondents, five felt that they received, through their role, important input into the process. "I am very satisfied with our procedure," said one respondent in whose district principals served as active members of the boards' team during negotiations. "We are active and informed before, during and after." Another in a district where principals had Role 2, informal advisor to the boards' team replied, "I am satisfied with our role in that we have to work with the teachers on a regular basis and, thus, ought not to be directly involved. . . . I feel our input is important to the board although it is not often followed."

The sentiment that principals should not be involved or minimally involved cropped up in many responses that will be presented later. Basically, it appears that many principals who responded to this question have a fear of alienating their staffs if they become too active in the process. Also echoing the previous statement is the respondent who was satisfied but . . . "not always happy with (the) results."

Another three satisfied respondents reported that they felt that their role was part of the expectations of an administrator in their district: "it has been a good learning experience. It places the principal in a . . . 'delicate' position but this is as it should be. I feel that it is important for a principal to know exactly what is being negotiated, etc. The principal's input may appear small but he has a chance to be heard. In my opinion to request not to be involved is a cop-out!!" "I am satisfied. Principals are definitely part of the management team." ". . . It is a necessary evil in a small district but part of the management function." These are some of the comments voiced by satisfied respondents in districts who are involved as per Role 1.

A group of three respondents were satisfied in that they felt that their role provided them with protection of sorts. "Principals serve an important role in negotiations by simply being present at the table. This stops a lot of undue and unjust criticism of building principals."

Another respondent echoing the protection feeling stated, ". . . (direct involvement) is, in my opinion essential considering the scope of negotiations today. More items . . . have a direct bearing on the principals role and function . . . therefore, input into positions taken by the (board) or final agreements reached . . . is crucial." Still another replied, "Principals need to be involved to keep the position of the principal from being given (negotiated) away."

A large group of 18 of the satisfied respondents were not actively involved, as Role 1 would have, and were quite happy about this. This sentiment was also repeated by many of those who were not satisfied and were actively involved in professional negotiations. Those satisfied with little or no involvement had these comments to make: "Although I am a middle manager I do not feel that I should be involved in negotiations (with) teachers. If a principal sides with the board then you lose your effectiveness with the teachers and if you side with the teachers you alienate the board." ". . . I feel it would be a detriment to a principal's position with his staff if he were an 'active' negotiator." ". . . we have had an administrative team concept . . . but when Mr. (Superintendent) asked if we wanted in on . . . negotiations . . . to sit at the table, we said no. Principals don't belong at the table." "I'm not placed in the middle between the board of education and the teachers. When asked for advice from the superintendent I give it. I asked that the teachers respect my position as being basically--management--with feelings of concern for teachers and therefore, in negotiations they deal directly with the superintendent." "Neutrality seems to serve us well as we have to deal with the teaching staff on a daily basis." Generally these comments are reflective of a larger group of respondents who want to avoid staff-principal conflict, yet want to be recognized as administrative persons, as management. As previously stated this group--those satisfied with relative noninvolvement, is supplemented by a similar dissatisfied group who are involved and do not want to be for the same reasons.

Some respondents, three, commented that they were satisfied but that they were unhappy with the status of negotiations in Ohio. "I'm satisfied, but, teachers and principals both get screwed in Ohio. Both groups are well below (the) national average salarywise," replied one disgruntled respondent. Another principal voiced concern for the situation the principal appears, to him, to be in--"Principals are in a lonely position in small and medium sized districts. There is little power in their hands when it comes to negotiations for themselves. I'm satisfied with our role in teacher negotiations, but it has been made clear to us that the schools can function without our small group if we were to attempt to withhold services." Concern for administrative bargaining was voiced by a few of the respondents. These will be presented later.

Not Satisfied With Role

The larger amount of comments beyond a simple "yes" or "no", 45 respondents, came from those who were not satisfied with the role principals had in their district with regard to professional negotiations between teachers and boards of education. Just as in the satisfied responses, these comments fell into several groups. Generally there were a number of respondents who commented that their role was too active and needed to be reduced to an advisory capacity or to noninvolvement. Still others felt that their role was not comprehensive enough and that they did not have enough input into negotiations for protective purposes or otherwise. Still others felt that they were totally frustrated and that only administrative

bargaining would gain them the voice or protection they needed to combat what they felt was an eroding of their positions by professional, board-teacher, negotiations.

Among the comments from those, ten in all, who feel that they should not be involved and were not satisfied with the level of involvement that their role afforded were statements reflective of the satisfied noninvolved respondents. The basic reason is, as stated, staff alienation. ". . . it tends to create a barrier between the administrative head of the building and his staff." "Principals are administrators and just assume that role without hesitation. I do, however, question if they should sit as a member of the boards' team because of the need they have to work so closely with teachers at the building level." "Being on the negotiations team really puts the pressure on an otherwise good administrative/staff relationship. I am not really that thrilled with the idea of being a negotiator." "I find it is difficult to be actively involved in negotiations and keep harmony with the staff. This is especially true if negotiations get very sticky." "The building principals should not be involved. Staff relations are too important to be allowed to suffer because of the stress brought on in periods of negotiations."

Several others in this group had the following comments: "We are basic members of the negotiating team assigned by the wishes of the superintendent. In my opinion principals should not be members of the negotiating team but should be aware beforehand of all negotiable items so as to eliminate any monster the principal may have to deal with."

Among those who felt the need for lesser involvement, Role 2, advisory capacity, seemed to be quite popular. "I would like to give input to the Board of Education in an informal way. I do not like being directly involved in negotiations," summed up the feelings of many in this category--those who were actively involved and did not wish to be in that capacity. Most of the respondents who felt that they would change their position to Role 2 simply indicated that "role 2 would be better."

While there were those who felt that they were too involved, 16 respondents who were not satisfied claimed that they needed more input and that they were not involved enough. One disgruntled principal stated, "Just like most other decision-making procedures, principals are left out but expected to live up to the agreement and back the board and the superintendent." This sentiment was repeated by still another respondent, "We are unfairly excluded. Principals deserve to have a significant input into the bargaining. We have to enforce the provisions of a contract that we have no say in building." The feeling that it is necessary to be involved because of the fact that the principal is responsible for much of the contract enforcement at the building level, as echoed above, is a consistent theme among respondents desiring more input. "I would like to see the principal become an active participant in negotiations, as opposed to being a neutral observer or advisor. The reason being that it is difficult to serve as the implementor or enforcer of policies and programs that you had no voice in formulating. I am not sure that those

who do negotiate are always aware of the net result of what they negotiate (has) in the individual buildings. The space 'in the middle' gets tighter all the time."

The following are statements made by principals who desire more input: "I am not completely satisfied with our position since we are generally in the dark when we attend meetings. We do speak sometimes at meetings and do give advice in caucus--but (we) are almost like bumps on a log during actual negotiations. We sometimes wonder, why have us?" ". . . would like more input prior to negotiations . . . want to be kept abreast of what is being done regarding items that we have to manage at the building level." ". . . more than one principal should be in the team . . . this year the high school principal was selected . . . the elementary positions . . . were cast aside." ". . . wish we had a more active role . . . the superintendent runs the whole show." "I would prefer not to be involved in salary items but feel a need to have input in items like: personnel, staffing, class size, etc." "I would prefer to be made aware of the progress of the negotiations team and to be asked to suggest changes that are needed in the present agreement." From these statements, it is clear that some principals want more input and a more active role in negotiations.

One of the reasons for desiring more input is made apparent by the comments of those who feel that principals need to be involved to protect themselves. Just as those who were satisfied with their involved role indicated that this involvement helped to keep the

position of the principal from being "bargained away", 12 respondents wanted more involvement for the same reason. They were quite vocal in their replies. "Principals are a part of the administrative team only in times of crisis! We have little say so, consequently, our authority is being negotiated away to the teachers. All principals should be asked for input and we should be represented at negotiations instead of being frozen out!" insisted one principal whose district reflected Role 7--noninvolvement. Another respondent from Role 7 district stated, "not satisfied! Principals should be formal advisors to the Board and Superintendent on all nonmonetary issues. Too often things are given away that make it very difficult to effectively manage a building." Another simply said, "not satisfied--we need more involvement--cut out of decisions that affect us!" However not all who felt they needed more input came from Role 7 districts. Seven respondents from districts with a Role 1--at the table representation--involvement for principals were not quite satisfied either. "Our arrangement has worked thus far. We have not had a strike and all points of impasse have been resolved. However, the solutions have not been in the best interests of the student, education, or principals at times. Frequently principal's recommendations have been totally ignored. The 'principal principle' has been eroded by a desire to keep the peace. Principals' needs must be given more recognition at the negotiations table before the keys are given away altogether." Another from a Role 2 district had this to say, "Role 1 would be more acceptable. In spite of our having consulting opportunity (with the Boards' team) the Boards'

negotiating team chose to ignore the strong advice of the principals' consultants in matters directly affecting the principals and, thusly, eroding the confidence of the principals in the management team and the workability of the present negotiations process." Finally, one respondent indicated that he was satisfied but also that he was not, "I wouldn't change the role of the principal (Role 2) but I believe that the negotiating unit is giving away the perogatives (sic) of the administration."

A final group of eight respondents regarding the satisfied-not satisfied question had suggestions that they felt would enhance the process: ". . . There is a need for better communications to disseminate results and changes in policy (resulting from bargaining)." ". . . would be better if principals would have a clearer understanding of district financial picture and boards' feelings." One principal questioned the adequacy of the representation that teachers received at the table, "The present method of collective bargaining seems adequate as far as administrative input is concerned. I question how adequately teachers are being represented at the building level under the present system of representation. For example, for the duration of (the present) contract, no teacher may serve as faculty representative if he/she crossed the picket line during the strike. In a building where nearly every teacher crossed the picket line each day, that doesn't leave a great selection to represent the teachers."

Upon review of the satisfaction question, it appears that most of those who responded to this question were satisfied not to be

directly involved in the negotiations process between teachers and boards of education or not satisfied because they were too involved. Since 54.5% of the principals responded to the survey selected Role 1, active involvement at the table, as being reflective of the role principals have in their district, this may be an indication of some reservations on the part of principals about serving in such a role. However, many principals, as discussed earlier, were quite desirous of having more input into the negotiations process. All of this is suggestive that Role 2, informal advisor to the board's team, may be the most acceptable to the majority of these principals. This, however, should be an area for future and further investigations.

Comments Regarding the Management Team

A group of ten respondents had comments regarding the management team. Some of the comments reported previously regarding whether or not the respondent was satisfied with the role principals had in their district included comments regarding the team concept. Additional comments regarding the feelings of some of the respondents about team management in their districts are presented below.

This survey asked for no formal opinion regarding team management. These comments were unsolicited and only a relatively small number of the respondents chose to make any comment regarding team management.

One respondent who indicated that team management was in full operation also indicated that, "we are still attempting to resolve problems and misunderstandings about team management." Another who

also reported full operation simply stated with no reasons given, "We hate it!" "We have achieved partial implementation. I would question, however, just how serious the Superintendent and his staff is about 'full operation'," suggested one skeptical principal. Along these same lines, another principal respondent had this to say, ". . . I do believe at times the position and the authority of the principal have been compromised by the 'management team'," and, still another, "We have one on paper but it really doesn't work!" Several respondents indicated that an attempt was being made to implement the concept but so far it had met, in the words of one, with "limited success." One respondent came out quite strongly against the concept as it existed in his district, "Yes, we have a so called management team. However, it exists only when it serves the purposes of the superintendent. Generally we have a 'team decision' when the decision is probably going to be unpopular. Often the first time we hear about this 'team decision' is after the Superintendent makes it and announces it as such."

Only one of ten respondents indicated that the management team was a favorable adoption in his district, "We have team management, in full operation and as far as we're concerned it's the best thing to come along since indoor plumbing!"

Comments Regarding Administrative Bargaining

Of the principals responding, five felt that principals needed to bargain for themselves. Their comments are presented as follows: "We need an organization with a backbone." The principals need to be

able to negotiate. It used to be that the superintendent did it for us but now the Board just gives us what we get and we have no say. We're not too happy about this set-up." ". . . Principals in Ohio should be better organized in order to get as a minimum the same rights afforded teachers, such as evaluations that aren't political hearsay plus some job security. Until the building leader is granted more security and autonomy and authority, the principalship in Ohio will not advance the ship of education." "I feel that in the areas of salary and benefits that principals should have the opportunity to negotiate and not be tied in with the teachers' salary scale as we are." "We are neither fish nor fowl. It is a very awkward position. You just sit there and listen and bite your lip. You root for the teachers on salary items (we're still tied to the teachers' salary schedule). This year's negotiations were settled, raises agreed upon in an agreement reached between the board and the teachers. After the fact the Superintendent told us that we would make too much money and the district would have a P. R. problem when we go for an operating levy. So now he wants to take us off of the teachers' salary schedule and cut the amount of raises we were scheduled to receive. We definitely need a separate negotiating organization. Principals get the least consideration of any group of employees because there are so few of us (little clout) and we are basically company people."

CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review of Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived role of the Ohio public school principal in professional negotiations. That is, the perceived role of the principal is the role that the principals surveyed perceived the principals in their district are currently engaged in regarding professional negotiations.

The population for this study was Ohio school principals. A sampling of Ohio school principals was selected at random. It was decided to select a random sample of 400 principals. Based on evidence presented by Newman (1973, p. 19), 347 is random sample size needed for representativeness of the population to be surveyed, 3,500, the approximate number of principals in the State of Ohio.

The primary method of data collection was by survey. This survey instrument was mailed to each of the 400 principals selected in the sample. The principals were asked to complete the demographic data and answer the questions regarding roles. Each survey was coded so as to provide follow-up to nonrespondents. After the data were collected, they were coded for computer analysis. The primary statistic used to interpret much of the data was the chi-square test of

significance. The responses from the survey instrument were classified into discrete categories and put in tabular form as a set of observed frequencies. A determination was made to ascertain whether the observed frequencies differed significantly from those frequencies expected. The critical value for this determination was .05 level of significance.

Findings were presented as responses to the research questions (see page 12). In those cases where the chi-square test of significance was not appropriate, descriptive research techniques were utilized to present the data.

Summary and Interpretation of the Findings

Research Question 1

What do principals perceive as their actual role in professional negotiations?

Role 1, direct involvement in professional negotiations as members of the board of education negotiating team during actual board-teacher bargaining sessions, was perceived by 54.5% of the principals responding to the survey as the role principals in their district served in during actual professional negotiations. Another 13.5% reported principals as advisors to the board team as per Role 2. These two roles combined show that 68% of the principals responding serve in districts that permit principal input, as members of management into the professional negotiations process between teachers' and boards of education.

A review of the literature has shown that a goodly portion of it appears to take the position that the principal is a member of management and as such should have input into this process. The findings of this study tend to support the proposition that this is indeed taking place in Ohio for at least two-thirds of Ohio public school principals. Based on these findings and the fact that the sample for this study was selected at random with an effort to control for nonresponse, it can be generalized that approximately 68% of Ohio public school principals have some role that is management oriented in regard to professional negotiations in districts where such negotiations take place.

It was also found that Role 7, noninvolvement, had the second highest identifications with 24.3% of the respondents perceiving that this was the role most indicative of the role principals have in their districts concerning negotiations between their boards of education and teachers. Noninvolvement as a role for principals was given support in the literature by Austin (1970), Nielson (1971), Coccia (1977), and others. Studies conducted by King (1969) and Austin (1970) found that most principals surveyed tended to report no involvement in negotiations between teachers and boards. While the findings of this study show that approximately one-quarter of those surveyed are non-involved, they appear to show that more principals are involved as management than those not, 68% as opposed to 24%. This may be reflective of a trend to incorporate the principal more as a management person in negotiations than may have been evident ten years ago.

It was found that less than 1% of all respondents indicated that they provided direct and/or indirect assistance to teachers' associations during negotiations with boards of education. This is not surprising given that most principals do not belong at this time. The data do not reveal what the true extent of those respondents', five in all, administrative duties are. It may be speculated, however, that they may not serve as full-time administrators, but rather as teachers-building heads. Further research in this area may shed some light on this speculation.

Research Question 2

Are there differences between the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals?

It was felt that there was a possibility that elementary and secondary principals may have differed in their perceptions. It was felt that secondary principals may be closer to the bargaining process and, therefore, may have a statistically significant different perception from that of elementary principals of the role of the principal in professional negotiations. No evidence was found to positively support this contention, either in the review of the literature or in the analysis of the data generated by this study. It can be concluded that elementary and secondary principals do not significantly differ in their perceptions of the role principals have concerning professional negotiations in their respective districts. In fact, the data, as presented in Table 9, show a good deal of similarity in their perceptions.

Research Question 3

Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to district size?

No statistically significant relationship was found to exist between perceived roles and district size (according to student population). In discussions with other principals regarding this question prior to the research there appeared to be several possibilities:

(1) because principals in smaller districts may be closer to the teachers on personal bases, they may perceive their role as being more teacher oriented or noninvolved in negotiations; (2) the principals in smaller districts may be closer to management because there are usually fewer administrators in smaller districts, therefore, they would tend to be management-oriented in negotiations; (3) principals in larger districts may tend to be noninvolved because of the possibility of their having their own bargaining units; (4) principals in larger districts may be more management oriented because of the power large local teachers' associations may have and the perceived threat they may pose to principals; (5) district size and perceived roles have no relationship of a statistical significance.

As reported, possibility 5, was found to exist. However, the data, as presented in Table 10, do, to some extent, appear to show that principals in larger districts serve in more of a managerial oriented role as per Role 1 and Role 2 than principals in smaller districts.

Research Question 4

Are there differences between the perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an avowed team management concept and those who reported that their district has no such avowed concept?

It was found that the majority of the respondents, 81.9% were familiar with the team management concept. Such a concept was recently recommended in detail by all of Ohio's administrative organizations and the Ohio School Board Association.

Those familiar, 81.9%, were asked to report on the status of this approach in their districts. Those reporting that the concept was not operational and was not under consideration amounted to 49.7% of all the respondents. These categories, coupled with those who reported it was not operational but under consideration, brought the relative number of respondents not serving in team management oriented districts to 63.2%. Generalization of these findings would lead to the conclusion that only 36.7% of Ohio's public school principals serve in districts that are adopting or have adopted the team management concept. It would appear that Ohio's public school districts have not operationalized this concept as desired by its state administrative organizations.

A statistically significant difference was found to exist at the .05 level between perceived role and the status of team management in the respondents' districts. It was found that the principals who reported the largest degree of noninvolvement in professional negotiations served in districts that have not adopted a team management

concept. It was likewise found that principals who reported a perceived managerial involvement as per Roles 1 and 2 served in districts that had adopted or were moving toward team management. In addition, a significant relationship at the .05 level was found to exist between the respondents' knowledge of team management and perceived role in negotiations. Specifically, those reporting they had no knowledge of team management also reported the highest degree of noninvolvement in professional negotiations. From these data, it may be concluded that principals who serve in districts with team management will tend to be involved in an active managerial capacity in professional negotiations between the board of education and the teachers. Principals who are not knowledgeable about team management and/or who serve in districts where team management is not operational tend not to be involved in professional negotiations. More simply stated, the greater the degree of movement toward team management in a given situation the greater the probability of managerial involvement of principals in professional negotiations. A study of the data in Table 11 will show this tendency.

Research Question 5

Are there differences between perceptions of principals who reported that their district has an administrative bargaining unit and those who reported that their district has no administrative bargaining unit?

A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between the formation of administrative bargaining units and district

size. Administrators in larger districts have a greater propensity to form administrative units for bargaining than administrators from smaller districts.

The data revealed that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of principals who serve in districts with administrative bargaining units and those who serve in districts without. In short, there was found no significant relationship between the roles of principals and the status of administrative bargaining units in the districts of those who responded.

Research Question 6

Are there differences in the perceptions of principals according to the length of teaching experience in years and the length of administrative experience?

It was felt that the more teaching experience a respondent had the less management oriented that respondent may perceive the role of the principal to be in professional negotiations. No statistically significant data were found to support this. Likewise, no significant data were found to support the converse, the more administrative experience the more management oriented a respondent might perceive the role of the principal as being during this process.

Research Question 7

Are there differences in perceptions of principals according to their level of educational attainment.

It was found that the higher the degree, or level of academic preparation of the respondent the more directly involved the respondent

perceived principals in his/her district are in actual board-teacher negotiations as a member of the boards' team as per Role 1. The lower the degree level, or level of academic preparedness, of the respondent the more indirectly involved, Role 2, or uninvolved, Role 7, the respondent perceived principals to be in negotiations.

It was felt that such a relationship might exist. The speculation was that those with greater academic preparedness and subsequently higher degrees might be more management oriented in their role perceptions due to the possibility of a stronger commitment to educational administration and the possibility that these perceptions may have been shaped by longer tenure as administrators. However, attempts to discover if a statistical relationship exists between degree level of the respondents and the variables of district size and administrative experience have been futile. At this point, no reasonable explanation for this finding can be offered.

Respondents Reported Satisfaction With Roles

Those surveyed were asked to report whether or not they were satisfied with the role they perceived principals as having in their districts in board-teacher negotiations. A significant statistical relationship was found to exist between role selection and satisfaction. Those who worked in districts where principals were perceived to have managerial roles, Roles 1 and 2, appeared to be more satisfied with their roles than those who worked in districts where the principal is perceived to have other roles including noninvolvement. From this it is possible to conclude that the more managerially

involved a principal is regarding teacher-board negotiations, the more satisfied he/she will be regarding that role.

This finding is further supported by the statistically significant relationship found to exist between satisfaction and team management. This finding reveals that the principals who work in districts with team management are more satisfied with their professional negotiations role than those who do not work in team management districts. Assuming that team management oriented districts would include principals in the professional negotiations process in a managerial capacity, this indeed, supports the role-satisfaction with role finding.

Additional Findings

1. Of the sampled principals, 99.7% were administrators in districts that had teachers' organizations.

2. Of the sampled principals, 94.4% served in districts where there was collective bargaining between these teachers' organizations and the board of education.

3. Of the sampled principals, 96.2% were not members of the local teachers' organization.

4. Those who declared that they served in districts that had some form of administrative bargaining unit came to 24.3% of the sample.

5. Those who reported that they belonged to these administrative units amounted to 21.5% of the sample.

6. Of the sampled principals, 63.2% reported that they were employed in districts where team management is not yet operational.

7. Of the sampled principals, 81.9% were familiar with the team management concept.

8. Of the sampled principals, 68.0% are employed in districts where principals serve in a managerial capacity either on the boards' negotiation team or as advisors to the boards' team during professional negotiations.

9. Where principals serve as members of the boards' team during actual bargaining, 54.8% reported that they serve as advisors who do not speak at the table but do advise in caucus.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions are made:

1. The majority of the elementary and secondary public school principals in Ohio serve in districts where boards of education and teachers engage in collective negotiations.

2. The majority of the elementary and secondary public school principals in Ohio are familiar with the team management concept as espoused by the state's administrative organizations in a 1978 publication endorsing administrative team management for Ohio's public schools. The majority of these principals, however, are employed in districts where team management is not yet operational as set forth in this publication.

3. The majority of the state's public school principals are not employed in districts that have administrative bargaining units

that bargain collectively with the board of education.

4. The majority of the public school principals in Ohio perceive that they have direct input into boards of education-teacher bargaining as either members of the board's team or advisors to the board's team through a principal who represents them on the team or through some other administrative person.

5. Larger school districts in Ohio, in terms of student enrollment, tend to have a greater propensity to have administrative bargaining units than smaller school districts.

6. Public school principals in Ohio are more satisfied with their negotiation role when they work in districts where they perceive principals have managerial roles either as team members or as advisors to the team during board of education-teacher negotiations.

7. Public school principals in Ohio are more satisfied with their negotiation role when they work in districts that have team management.

Recommendation for Practice

1. It is recommended that superintendents and boards of education continue to involve principals in the negotiations process. Rob Stein, Ohio School Boards Association's Associate Director for Labor Relations (1981, p. 14), makes a strong case for the inclusion of principals in the professional negotiations process. He feels that districts ". . . should include building principals in all aspects of collective bargaining," including "the presence of principals at the bargaining table." The findings of this study show that principals

who are employed in districts where they are involved in professional negotiations as part of an administrative team are relatively more satisfied with this role in collective bargaining than principals who are employed in districts that do not involve principals in professional negotiations.

2. It is recommended that both administrative professional organizations and administrative training programs at the university level take measures to provide both prospective and current administrators, especially those at or destined for the building level, with more training with respect to working under the constraints of a negotiated agreement. Areas such as contract interpretation, contract enforcement, handling of apparent contract violations and grievances are but several of the topics that building level administrators are now facing or will be facing in the future. Possibly closer articulation and cooperation between educational administration faculties at the university level and these professional organizations might prove rewarding in regards to the formulation of such training and inservice programs.

3. According to the findings of this study, the majority of Ohio's school districts have not made substantive movement toward a team management approach. As previously mentioned, it was found that a relationship between administrative satisfaction and team management does exist. If Ohio's school districts wish to enhance the satisfaction of their building level managers, and, thus, enhance the possibilities for their increased effectiveness through allowing their valuable

input into the decisions which effect them, it is recommended that they move affirmatively toward this approach and do so in a manner that is clearly genuine. As the respondents' comments in this study revealed, when team management is undertaken in a less than sincere manner, principal resentment can be a prime result.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It is recommended that the role of the principal in professional negotiations be studied much more thoroughly. Included in such investigations should be how administrative bargaining units and/or the team management effect this role, the effect of principals' active participation as a board team member upon administrative-staff relations at the building level, the principal's role in contract administration and the role of the principal during employee work stoppages.

2. The data presented in this study revealed that a statistically significant relationship between district size and administrative bargaining units did exist. The study showed that the larger the school district in terms of student enrollment, the greater the tendency of administrative bargaining units. Thomas (1981) found that there was "a significant relationship between principals who were part of a management team and who did not belong to a bargaining organization" (p. 9). It is recommended that more research be conducted to investigate the development of management teams and administrative bargaining units to determine what variables may have been conducive to the establishment at the district level of one or the other. Such

variables may be: district size; leadership characteristics of the superintendent; financial status of the district; teacher militancy in the district. In districts where both administrative bargaining units and the management team are in existence, a study regarding the relationship of these should be undertaken to determine how they both function in concert.

3. A more in-depth study is recommended regarding the satisfaction of Ohio's public school principals with their roles in professional negotiations. A study focused on satisfaction and the reasons why principals are or are not satisfied may provide useful and interesting results. One study that is recommended in the investigation of the role and the role satisfaction, to include attitudes toward professional negotiations, of principals who have come from outside the district to serve in that position and principals who have come from the teaching ranks in a particular district and, importantly, the same building where they currently serve as principal. Studies regarding "place bound" versus "career bound" individuals have been conducted in other areas. Such a study, as recommended here, regarding principals and professional negotiations may serve of value to principals, superintendents, and boards of education.

4. It is recommended that an in-depth study of the team management concept and Ohio's schools be conducted. This study should address such questions as: What is the status of team management in Ohio's districts? What do principals, superintendents and boards of

education feel are the benefits and shortcomings of this approach? What effect has team management, or the lack thereof, had upon the managerial role of the principal? This study revealed that many of Ohio's schools have not adopted this approach despite the urging of the state's professional administrator organization and the school boards' association. An investigation into why this is so would prove rewarding and interesting.

5. Additional research regarding other managerial roles performed by principals should be undertaken so as to better clarify the principal's role as a manager. What part do principals play in recommending employees for promotion/tenure? These and other questions will help provide more insight into the role of the principal as a manager.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear Principal:

Attached is a questionnaire that I am asking you to complete and return to me as soon as it is possible for you to do so. For your convenience, there is a self-addressed envelope enclosed. The purpose of this study is to collect data to help determine the current role of the principal in collective negotiations between boards of education and teachers. You will be asked to complete questions pertaining to certain selected demographic characteristics and then select one of eight positions that best typifies principals in your district.

I know that this is a very busy time of year for you and I hate to take your precious time. However, the questionnaire is easy to complete and, as a fellow principal, I feel, as I am sure that you do, that collective bargaining is one of the more critical challenges we face in attempting to operate a building. Your cooperation is most needed.

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence and used only for the purpose of this project. Your name and the name of your school district will remain anonymous.

Because of the scope and the high expense of this study, please take the time to complete the survey and return. They are coded by a number to allow me to follow-up with those I have not received responses from. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions call or write me:

Louis Daugherty
Tallmadge High School
484 East Avenue
Tallmadge, Ohio 44278
(216) 633-5505

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cordially,

APPENDIX B
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Principal:

Recently a packet containing a questionnaire and a letter of explanation was sent to you. The letter asked that you fill out the questionnaire and return it to me so that I may complete a study I am doing regarding the role of the principal in professional negotiations between boards of education and teachers' associations. As yet I have not received your questionnaire.

Attached is another copy of that letter and another questionnaire. You will find that the questionnaire is relatively easy to complete. I know that you are very busy at this time of year, but if you could take a few minutes to assist a fellow principal, your cooperation and sacrifice of time will be greatly appreciated.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to call or write me at work or at home. Below are the addresses and telephone numbers for your convenience.

Louis Daugherty, Principal
Tallmadge High School
484 East Avenue
Tallmadge, Ohio 44278
(216) 633-5505

or

Louis Daugherty
1775 Carver Lane
Hudson, Ohio 44236
(216) 650-4018

When you have completed the questionnaire, please place it in the attached self-addressed envelope and return it to me.

Thank you.

Cordially,

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

The Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations

The data collected by use of this instrument will be used solely for the purpose of this research project. The names of all respondents and their districts will be held in strict confidence and will remain anonymous in the study and data presentation.

Directions for Completing the Questionnaire:

Please check the most appropriate answer to each item. When you have completed the questionnaire, please place it in the attached stamped-addressed envelope and return it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

R. Louis Daugherty
1775 Carver Lane
Hudson, Ohio 44236
1-216-650-4018

Personal Data:

I. A. Approximate Pupil Population in your district during the 1979-80 school year:

1. under 2,000 _____
2. 2,000 to 4,999 _____
3. 5,000 to 9,999 _____
4. 10,000 to 19,999 _____
5. 20,000 or over _____

B. You are currently: (based on your certification and/or building responsibilities)

1. a secondary principal _____
2. an elementary principal _____

- C. Does your district have a local teachers'/education association?
1. Yes _____
 2. No _____
- D. If you answered yes to question C, are you a member of this organization?
1. Yes _____
 2. No _____
- E. Do the teachers in your district engage in professional negotiations with the board of education or its representatives?
1. Yes _____
 2. No _____
- F. Please check the age range in which you fall:
1. 25 or under _____
 2. 26 - 30 _____
 3. 31 - 35 _____
 4. 36 - 40 _____
 5. 41 - 45 _____
 6. 46 - 50 _____
 7. 51 or over _____
- G. Sex:
1. Male _____
 2. Female _____
- H. Highest level of educational attainment:
1. MA _____
 2. M + additional hours _____
 3. Specialist degree _____
 4. Doctorate _____
- I. Please check the range indicating the number of years experience as a classroom teacher you have had:
1. 0 - 5 _____
 2. 6 - 10 _____
 3. 11 - 15 _____
 4. 16 - 20 _____
 5. 21 - 25 _____
 6. 26 - 30 _____
 7. 31 or over _____

J. Please check the range indicating the number of years of experience as an administrator you have had (regardless of role):

- 1. 0 - 5 _____
- 2. 6 - 10 _____
- 3. 11 - 15 _____
- 4. 16 - 20 _____
- 5. 21 - 25 _____
- 6. 26 - 30 _____
- 7. 31 or over _____

K. Does your district have an administrative-supervisory bargaining unit?

- 1. Yes _____
- 2. No _____

L. If yes to question K, are you a member:

- 1. Yes _____
- 2. No _____

M. Recently, state administrative organizations including those representing the principals and superintendents as well as the school boards' association endorsed and recommended the management team as an approach to operating Ohio's public schools. Are you familiar with this recommended approach?

- _____ A. Yes
- _____ B. No

1. If yes, what do you think the status is regarding this approach in your district?

- _____ a. not currently in operation, and not being considered.
- _____ b. not currently in operation but under serious consideration.
- _____ c. currently undergoing implementation.
- _____ d. currently in full operation.

Principal Roles

The function of the following statements is to determine the actual role of the principal in the professional negotiations process in your school district.

Following are eight positions (Roman number I through VIII) that principals may actually be in with respect to professional negotiations. Check the role that best reflects that of the principals in your district. (Please choose only one position).

- _____ I. In my school district the principals, or a principal representing this administrative position, serve as members of the Board of Education negotiating team in actual teacher-board negotiations sessions.

(If you selected Position I, in which of the following roles does the principal or principals' representative serve in your district?)

- _____ A. Chief negotiator
 _____ B. Negotiator (speaking member of team)
 _____ C. Formal advisor (Usually does not speak during negotiations but gives advice and opinions in caucus)
 _____ D. Observer (usually does not offer, nor is called on, to give advice or opinions during negotiations and in caucus but considered a Board of Education representative)
 _____ E. Other (Please specify) _____
 _____ F. Do not know

If you selected position I, the principals or principal, representing this administrative position are selected as members of the negotiating team by which of the following?

- _____ 1. Superintendent
 _____ 2. Fellow Principals
 _____ 3. Board of Education
 _____ 4. Other - Please specify: _____
 _____ 5. Do not know

- _____ II. Principals in my district do not sit at the table during actual negotiations but do serve in an informal advisory capacity to the board of education negotiating team. That is, principals, or a principal representing that administrative position, meet with the superintendent or his/her representative and/or board members to assess the demands of the teacher negotiating team relative to the effects on school management and the educational

program making recommendations to the superintendent or his/her representative and/or the board members concerning responses to these demands.

If you selected position II, how often do these meetings take place?

- _____ A. Only at the beginning of the negotiations process
- _____ B. On a regular basis during the negotiations process
- _____ C. Not on a regular basis, but periodically during the negotiations process/
- _____ D. Only at what may be deemed crisis points during the negotiations process (e.g.: prior to an apparent impasse; prior to an apparent agreement)
- _____ E. Other - Please specify _____

- _____ F. Do not know

_____ III. Principals in my district serve as members of the teachers' negotiation team during actual bargaining sessions.

If you selected position III, which of the following selects these principals to serve in that capacity?

- _____ 1. Members of the Teachers' Association
- _____ 2. President of the Teachers' Association
- _____ 3. Fellow Principals
- _____ 4. Other - Please specify _____
- _____ 5. Do not know

If you selected position III, do principals in your district have membership in the negotiating unit as teachers?

- _____ a. All
- _____ b. Some

If some, which of the following statements best describes the existing situation in your district?

- _____ b-1. mostly elementary principals
are members (including middle school:
6-8)
- _____ b-2. mostly secondary principals are mem-
bers (J. H. S. and/or H. S.: 7-12)
- _____ b-3. membership is fairly evenly divided
between elementary and secondary prin-
cipals
- _____ c. None
- _____ d. Other - Please describe _____

- _____ e. Do not know
- _____ IV. Principals in my district do not sit at the table during
actual negotiations but do serve in an informal advisory
capacity to the teachers' negotiating team. That is,
principals, or a principal representing that adminis-
trative position, meet with the teachers' negotiators
to advise them in the preparation of positions that may
effect school management and the educational program
and/or to make recommendations concerning these positions.
- _____ V. Principals in my district serve as neutrals consultants
to both the board of education and the teachers during
negotiations. That is, they do not sit at the table
during actual negotiation sessions but act as resource
persons providing information to both parties upon re-
quest.
- _____ VI. Principals in my district serve as neutral observers
at the table during negotiations. They do not partic-
ipate in actual bargaining but rather they serve as
resource persons providing information, when called
upon, to both parties.
- _____ VII. Principals in my district are not involved in any manner,
in professional negotiations between boards of education
and teachers.
- _____ VIII. If none of the foregoing positions represent, or even
closely approximates, the actual role of principals in
your district, please take time to elaborate on the
role principals do play in your district here: (you
may continue on the back of the questionnaire if you
wish).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almo, C. D. The reactions of principals to the effects of collective bargaining on the decision-making structure of public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1974.
- American Association of School Administrators. 1976 Resolutions of American Association of School Administrators. Arlington, Virginia: AASA, 1976.
- American School Board Association. The brewing and, perhaps still preventable revolt of the school principals. American School Boards Journal, 1976, 163(1), 25-27.
- Andree, R. G. Collective negotiations. Lexington: Heath-Lexington Books, 1970.
- Austin, D. C. A study of attitudes of Texas public high school principals toward the principal's role in collective negotiations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1970.
- Bardall, E. E. An analysis of the role of Ohio public school principals in collective negotiations procedures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1976.
- Barea, N. Principals - Yes, they are management. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61(405), 81-84. (a)
- Barea, N. Separate bargaining units - A must for today's principal. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61(409), 43-51. (b)
- Bass, R. The case for keeping your principals out of the collective bargaining brawl. The American School Board Journal, 1973, 6(160), 36.
- Boettcher, B. E. An analysis of superordinate and subordinate perceptions of secondary principals' leader behavior and its relationship to principals' collective bargaining units. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Minnesota, 1976.

- Bridges, E. & Cooper, B. S. Collective bargaining for school administrators. Theory Into Practice, 1976, 15(4), 306-313.
- Campbell, D. & Stanley, J. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Skokie, Illinois: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Coccia, J. A. Principals: Not middle management. The NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61(405), 79-81.
- Cochran, W. G. Some methods for strengthening the common X_2 tests. Biometrics, 1954, (10), 417-451.
- Confederation of Oregon School Administrators and the Oregon School Boards Association. The management team in education. Salem, Oregon, June 24, 1974.
- Cooper, B. S. Collective bargaining comes to school management. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 58(3), 202-204.
- Cunningham, L. L. Collective negotiations and the principalship. In P. W. Carlton and H. I. Goodwin (Eds.), The collective dilemma: Negotiations in education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1969.
- Dempsey, R. A. Principals and negotiations. The NASSP Bulletin, 1975, 59(389), 60-63.
- Drucker, P. F. The effective administrator. The NASSP Bulletin, 1964, (291), 154-157.
- Eiche, M. L. A study of the effects of collective negotiations upon the functional role of selected school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Engel, R. A. Teacher negotiation: History and comment. Journal of Law and Education, 1972, 3 487-495.
- Evans, M. W., Knox, D. M., & Wiedenman, C. F. Trends in collective bargaining in public education. Seven Hills, Ohio: American Association of School Personnel Administrators, 1978.
- Getzels, J. W. Changing values challenge the school. The School Review, 1957, 65(1), 92-102.
- Geyer, G. A., Jr. A role model for principals in collective negotiations between teacher, organizations and boards of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1973.

- Gmelch, W. H. & Erickson, K. A. School management teams: Purpose, structure, and operation. Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 1977, 21(1).
- Hooks, A. R. A study of the relationship between collective negotiations and the activities of the secondary school principal. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1969.
- Jacobson, P. B., Reavis, W. C., & Logsdon, J. D. The effective school principal (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Johnson, L. E. The role of the principal in collective negotiations as perceived by Iowa educators and board members. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1972.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kimbrell, R. M. The development of procedural guidelines for the school principal to utilize while establishing his role in collective bargaining. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1977.
- King, J. C. Effects of collective negotiations upon the role of selected elementary school principals in Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.
- Ladd, J. F. The Ohio Council of Administrative Personnel Associations (OCAPA): A study of collective bargaining by organized middle management administrators in Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1977.
- Lieberman, M. Negotiations: past, present, and future. School Management, 1973, 16
- Martin, D. The brewing--And perhaps, still preventable--Revolt of the school principals. The American School Board Journal, 1976, 163(1), 25-27.
- McCobb, D. P. Principal and superintendent perceptions of and expectations for the role of the principal in teacher collective bargaining in Massachusetts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College, 1980.
- McCullough, C. & Van Loche, A. Statistical concepts. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

- McConnell, L. F. A study of the influence of collective bargaining by school administrators on the management functions of selected Michigan school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- McCormick, E. J. & Tiffin, J. Industrial psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- McCumsey, N. L. The effects of professional negotiations on secondary school principal's decision-making functions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967.
- Metzler, J. H. The need for limitation upon the scope of negotiations in public education I. Journal of Law and Education, 1972, 3, 487-495.
- Michael, L. S. The principal and trends in professional negotiations. The NASSP Bulletin, 1968, (328), 105-109.
- Minimum, E. W. Statistical reasoning in psychology and education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. How do principals feel about bargaining? NASSP Newsletter/Spotlight, 1976.
- National Education Association, Department of Elementary Principals. Report of the national conference on professional negotiations. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1973.
- Newman, I. Basic procedures in conducting survey research. Akron, Ohio: The University of Akron, 1973.
- Nicholas, H. O. A comparison of perceived constraints on the role performance of selected elementary and secondary principals in urban and suburban school districts with different collective bargaining status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1976.
- Nielson, R. L. Role expectations for principals in administration and in collective negotiations as perceived by representatives of selected urban school areas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1971.
- Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators. The management team: A recommended approach for operating Ohio's public schools. Westerville, Ohio: OASSA, 1978.

- Powell, E. M. Unions: The demise of the public education system. In American Association of School Administrators: 1978 convention reporter. Arlington, Virginia: AASA, 1978.
- Poort, S. M. Attitudes of selected Kansas superintendents, principals in a collective negotiations environment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Kansas, 1968.
- Price, R. S. The role of the secondary principal in the collective negotiation process in selected New Jersey school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1975.
- Randles, Harry E. Attitudes of school board members and professional staff toward labor and management. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 1972, 193-202.
- Randles, H. E. The principal and negotiated contracts. The National Elementary Principal, 1975, 55(2), 57-61.
- Scott, W. R. Professionals in bureaucracies: Areas of conflict. In H. Vollmer and D. Mills (Eds), Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Scott, W. R. Power processes in formal organizations. In W. R. Scott (Ed.), Social processes and social structures: An introduction to sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. & Carver, F. D. The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1975.
- Shannon, T. A. The principals' management role in collective negotiations, grievances, and strikes. The Journal of Secondary Education, 1970, 45(2), 51-56.
- Shelton, R. D. Congruence of principal and teacher perceptions of changes in the role of the elementary principalship in New Jersey since the advent of collective negotiations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1976.
- Shils, E. B. & Whittier, C. T. Teachers, administrators and collective bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.
- Smith, R. E. The principal's role in collective negotiations in the state of Washington. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oregon, 1972.

- Smith, S. S. Some effects of collective negotiations on principal-staff relations as perceived by the secondary school principals in Illinois. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970.
- Stein, R. The principal's role in collective bargaining. The Ohio School Boards' Journal, 1981, 25(6), 14-15.
- Sussman, E. A. The elementary school principal under collective bargaining. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern California, 1978.
- Thomas, W. F. The management team - is it a reality: An Ohio survey. The Ohio School Boards' Journal, 1981 25(6), 14-15.
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding educational research: An introduction. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Wagstaff, L. H. The unionized principals: You may be next. NASSP Bulletin, 1973, (376), 40-47.
- Weber, M. The theory of social and economic organization. Trans. by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1977.
- Wells, L. W. A study of the role of the principal in collective negotiations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. George Peabody College for Teachers, 1978.
- Williams, R. C. The principal and collective bargaining. Thrust, 1977, 7(1), 11-14, 29.
- Wilson, R. E. Administration of an attendance unit - the principal. In R. E. Wilson (Ed.), Educational administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.
- Wood, C. L. & Findley, D. The secondary school principal and collective bargaining. American Secondary Education, 1975, 5(3), 13-16.